Pacific School of
Religion
Berkeley, Calif.

THE EXPOSITOR

VOL. III.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/expositor-1875_1925_3

THE EXPOSITOR

NINTH SERIES

Volume III

HODDER AND STOUGHTON, LIMITED
WARWICK SQUARE, LONDON, E.C.

MCMXXV

Sen. 9
V. 3
1925-11

Made and Printed in Great Britain.
Butler & Tanner Ltd., *Frome and London*

CURRENT ISSUES.

In his most recent book, on *The Holy Spirit and the Church*, Dr. Gore notices an assumption in the New Testament. "Both St. John and St. Paul," he observes, "appear to have a robust confidence that the good man—the spiritual man—will come to a right conclusion. They do not seem to be vexed with our problem, that so many good and spiritual men, as we must judge them to be, come to what we must also judge to be the wrong conclusion. They seem to assume that genuine goodness and acceptance of the truth even in this world will be found together." By "the truth" Dr. Gore means the Christian faith. And it is quite obvious that this robust confidence is not shared by thoughtful observers to-day, whether they are in the apostolic succession or outside it. Who can assume that the creed will be accepted by anyone, provided only that he is honest and open-minded?

* * * * *

This is the question asked and discussed by Canon Quick, of Carlisle, in an American journal called *The Anglican Theological Review*. Canon Quick's article opens the October number, and is entitled "The Christian Tradition and the Modern Spirit." What is the change which has come over us since mediævalism passed? This, that instead of "the truth" we prefer to speak about "truth." In the mediæval scholasticism "the truth" became a codified system resting on metaphysical principles, and men had to accept this. Nowadays men seek to be loyal to truth, or, in other words, devoted to reality, but they do not profess, and they do not desire, to bind themselves to a truth, or "the truth," in some previously arranged shape.

* * * * *

This spirit of enquiry and independent research is vital. "Our teachers," as Canon Quick remarks, encourage it, because they "are accustomed to conceive of reality as of a world wherein

new discoveries may indefinitely alter and supersede all that is known." And it has the wholesome quality of optimism. To love truth means at any rate that one believes it is possible to know what is true. Also, it precludes neutrality ; it presupposes that the ultimate nature of things is somehow good. Such is the first point made by Canon Quick. He analyses this zeal for truth in order to show that, often unconsciously, it contains much that is common to itself and to Christian orthodoxy.

* * * * *

Then he turns to the Church, and blames it for failing to present the true intellectual meaning of the Cross. The reason why Christian doctrine has got out of touch with the modern mind is that there has not been a proper interpretation of the Cross. Here the Canon will win agreement from many clergymen and ministers who find themselves unable to present their message with force and passion largely because they feel a " stop in the mind " when they come to speak of the atoning love of God. What the true interpretation is to be, the Canon does not say. But he insists that our Lord's religious message implied a " deeply realistic and scientific study of the world and of human nature," and that He " never purchases a cheap edification by saying things which are not really true to life." A true interpretation of the Gospel, he urges, demands an unflinching spirit of honesty, which leads each of us to be willing to go to school in and with the world, without imposing upon it his preconceived ideas of what it ought to be."

* * * * *

There is one sure note of this love of truth, and that is the willingness to have one's own faults pointed out kindly and firmly. To resent reproof is a mark of childishness. Anyone who professes to seek reality will welcome even the unpleasant experience of having defects in his character or creed exposed. " Am I become your enemy because I tell you the truth ? " So Paul asked the Galatians, who had taken offence at his plain-speaking. " O foolish Galatians," he might well exclaim. For this temper is an infallible mark of folly. The truth is not what we like to hear or to believe about ourselves or the world ; it is generally something much more uncomfortable.

* * * * *

But such a Galatian temper is not yet exorcised. An instance

of it occurs in Dr. Nicol MacNicol's new book on *The Making of Modern India*. Dr. MacNicol is one of the most thoughtful and sympathetic missionaries of the Scottish Church in India, and his book is an invaluable guide to right thinking upon Indian affairs. A review of it will appear in our pages before long. Meantime we may notice what he says about Indian sensitiveness. He notes how "the greater part of the actual Hinduism of to-day sprawls across the land, naked and gross like the red-painted stones that represent its gods." It is small wonder that Western visitors are disgusted and repelled. Even some finer minds in Hinduism itself admit the indecencies and moral emptiness of the national religion. But how do the Hindus take the words of truth spoken by those who would free them from this moral handicap? As Dr. MacNicol admits, they regard such critics as enemies. "When Lord Curzon hinted that veracity was not a universal virtue in Bengal this gibe outweighed a hundred political benefactions, and will never be forgotten. So when a distinguished Christian scholar on a visit to India spoke of the tutelary deity of Mysore as a she-devil—which in her origin she undoubtedly is, and she has not yet by any means entirely sloughed the horns and the hoofs—he was guilty of an unforgivable indiscretion"!

* * * * *

This is ominous. The presence of the immoral in Hinduism is bad, and so is the disposition to regard any criticism of it as a personal insult. Sensitiveness of such a kind is not a note of growth but of decadence. It is a form of suspicion, and of suspicion in its lowest shape, mixed up with complacency and a narrow national pride, a disquieting symptom.

* * * * *

In the November number (p. 324) we noted Professor Burkitt's explanation of the spirit which led our Lord to cleanse the temple. Mr. A. D. Martin offers another impression of the scene in his thoughtful study of our Lord's life, which is called *Aspects of the Way*. He takes the episode as another phase of the earlier temptation to bow down to Satan and win dominion by means of force. Jesus displayed vigour and indignation here. But why did He stop when He did? Because, says Mr. Martin, "His indignation had swept Him up to the very frontiers that delimit the rival kingdoms of God and the world." That is,

Jesus checked Himself at the right moment. "It is not too much to say that those ten minutes of the Cleansing of the Temple were more critical for the character and destiny of Jesus than all the forty days in the wilderness."

* * * * *

The basis of this interpretation lies in two considerations. One is, that the very desire of doing good may lead us to take a wrong step, or to adopt false methods. As Shakespeare put it:

> "Most dangerous
> Is that temptation that doth goad us on
> To sin in loving virtue."

The other is, that Jesus possessed a "masterful strength" of nature. No man of feeble goodness would have been assailed by such a temptation. It struck at one who was "rich in blood, iron in physique, with continuous mental surge and energy, and instinct of command." Our Lord, as Mr. Martin aptly adds, "did not need that exhortation of the Psalmists which our quietists would be the better for heeding, 'Ye that love the Lord, hate evil!'"

* * * * *

The article in this number, by Dr. Barnes, upon the Bible and Islam, will open up a new subject for some readers. It is a subject which is touched, from another side, by Mr. Alfred Guillaume, in his recent monograph upon *The Traditions of Islam.* For, while the Kor'an is the bible of the world of Islam, it must not be forgotten that just as the Jews require their Talmud, to apply the Old Testament to more developed life, so the people of Islam appeal to traditions, i.e. to a "vast literature" whose aim is "to provide an authoritative standard of belief and conduct based upon the word and deed of Muhammad which shall be binding upon the whole of the Muhammadan world." Mr. Guillaume describes the rise and scope and content of this extraordinary literature, which professes to enshrine early oral traditions of or about the prophet.

* * * * *

One tendency, he notices, is to approximate Muhammad to Jesus Christ in some respects, especially as a worker of miracles. What the prophet really was, Mr. Guillaume does not profess to say. "No biographer, either ancient or modern, has succeeded

in giving his readers an entirely satisfactory appreciation of the baffling personality of the great prophet of Arabia. His loyalty and treachery, abstinence and debauchery, wisdom and ignorance, mediocrity and inspiration, demand the pen of a Boswell." Yet it is clear that he was no worker of miracles. He himself declared that he was not sent by God to work miracles. So later traditions set to work to furnish him with some, lest he should seem inferior to the Christians' Jesus. And they borrowed from the New Testament, for example, from the story of the feeding of the five thousand. Also words of Jesus were transferred to Muhammad. In the traditions, as Mr. Guillaume observes, "the fallible human figure of Muhammad has faded into oblivion," and colours of a semi-divine character have been infused into the picture, drawn largely from the New Testament account of Jesus.

THE TEN BEST BOOKS ON THE APOSTOLIC AGE.

In responding to the Editor's request for a list of the Ten Best Books on the Apostolic Age, it is desirable to define the class of readers for which such a list is most suitable. It is obviously not designed for Professors of Theology, who will seek to acquaint themselves with all, or at least most, of the literature relevant to the subjects on which they lecture ; nor can it have in view persons who, though not Professors, yet are deeply interested in theology and at the same time possess such means and leisure as allow them to pursue the study of it without restriction of any kind. The readers whose needs it is hoped to serve are those whose library must for various reasons be circumscribed in extent, and who wish for guidance in selecting just those books which are likely to be most helpful. And, since time as well as money may be a consideration of importance, it will be expedient to limit the proposed list almost exclusively

to books that are written in, or have been translated into, English.[1]

At the first glance, the Apostolic Age appears to be a comparatively simple period for study, not, of course, through any absence of complexity (for it is many-sided), but because there is only a single narrative of it, since the *Acts of the Apostles* is the solitary continuous account, of first century origin, which we have of the history of the Christian Church for the thirty years or so that followed the Crucifixion of our Lord. Though a very cursory perusal of it shows that it leaves obscure much that we should like to know, yet, so far as it goes, it seems on the surface to deserve confidence. It is traditionally attributed to Luke, who was a companion and fellow-traveller of Paul and cannot but have come in contact with many other individuals who were prominent in the diffusion of Christianity. Its writer was most deeply interested in the events which he recounts ; so that he is not likely to have neglected his opportunities of obtaining information about them. And since tradition also connects Luke's name with the authorship of the Third Gospel, the writer of which claims to have traced accurately from the first the course of the history included in it, there is raised a strong presumption that the continuation of that history in *Acts* has been compiled in the same careful and conscientious spirit.

In point of fact, however, the ascertainment of the facts of the Apostolic Age is an extremely difficult one. For although *Acts* is a work skilfully planned and graphically written, and although it exhibits in numerous passages accurate knowledge of the scenes and conditions of the

[1] Amongst French and German commentaries on *Acts* may be mentioned Loisy, *Les Actes des Apôtres*, and the works of Holtzmann (in the *Hand-commentar zum N.T.*), and of Preuschen (in the *Handbuch zum N.T.*, edited by Lietzmann).

occurrences recorded, it is not really the sole source of information to which we have access. Sidelights upon the history of the time covered by it are thrown by Paul's Epistles, for though these are hortatory, argumentative, or didactic, and not narrative, in character, there are plentiful allusions to the experiences of the Apostle who is more conspicuous than any other figure in the latter half of *Acts*. And these references in several instances are not easily reconcilable with the account in *Acts*, so that we soon become sensible that a history of the Apostolic Age has to be extracted from data which are in some measure conflicting. And inasmuch as any collision between what is stated in *Acts* and what is said by, or may be inferred from, Paul (who for the incidents he relates, or alludes to, is a first-hand authority) cannot fail to affect our estimate of the value of *Acts* for the period of the Apostle's ministry, it is bound also to disturb our confidence in the book for the earlier period for which it is our only authority. And doubts being once started, we are driven to investigate the question of authorship, for Luke's name nowhere occurs in the book, and the nature of some of the discrepancies between *Acts* and the Pauline Epistles are surprising, if the former is really the product of an intimate friend of Paul. And then there is the interesting subject of the text. For whereas in the New Testament books generally the number of variants occurring among the oldest and most trustworthy MSS. is comparatively small, in *Acts* the divergences between the Codex Bezæ and the residue of our codices is so considerable that the idea has occurred to more than one scholar that Luke wrote two drafts of his second work, both of which have been preserved. For dealing with the problems thus classified the works most likely to be found useful may be conveniently considered in the reverse order.

The Textual problem relates to the origin and comparative value of the remarkable additions which the Bezan MS. supplies to the text of *Acts* as presented by the large majority of manuscripts, coupled with the absence from the former of a certain number of words and clauses found in the latter. One view is that the Bezan codex preserves *Acts* in the form in which its author first wrote it, whilst the residue of early MSS. have it in a revised and more concise shape, produced by the omission of expressions which the writer came to deem superfluous. The two hypothetical drafts are given in Blass's *Acta Apostolorum* (with Latin notes), 1895, the supposed first draft being distinguished as the β text, whilst the second is styled the α text. (The symbol β, of course, is here used with a different significance from that which it has in the textual criticism of the New Testament in general, where it denotes what Westcott and Hort call the Neutral Text, represented chiefly by the Vatican MS.) A very useful translation of the Bezan text, with its peculiarities indicated by leaded type, has been supplied recently by Canon J. M. Wilson (*The Acts of the Apostles translated from the Codex Bezæ with an Introduction on its Lucan origin and importance*, 1923). A different view of this text is taken by Dr. Rendel Harris, who has offered an explanation of some of its features in *A Study of Codex Bezæ* (Cambridge Texts and Studies).

The importance of the Textual question, however, is altogether dwarfed by that of the Historical problem occasioned by the discrepancies between *Acts* and the Pauline Epistles—discrepancies which culminate in the account they respectively give of the controversy concerning the relations of Gentile Christians to the Jewish ceremonial law. Various difficulties attaching to the narrative of *Acts*, when it is brought into comparison with the Pauline Epistles, were pointed out about seventy years ago by Zeller in a work

entitled *The Contents and Origin of the Acts of the Apostles*, 1854 (English Translation, 1875); but the most important books in English at the present time in this connexion are *The Early Epistles of St. Paul*, by Kirsopp Lake, and *The Beginnings of Christianity*, edited by F. J. Foakes-Jackson and K. Lake. The first of these is more immediately concerned with the Epistles of Paul to Thessalonica, Corinth, Galatia and Rome; but it includes discussions of several narratives in *Acts*. There is a valuable chapter on the Judaistic controversy and the text of the Apostolic Decree (in *Acts* xv.); whilst Paul's comments upon Glossolalia (in 1 *Cor.* xiv.) are used to elucidate what happened at Pentecost (as recounted in *Acts* ii.). The second of the two works named above is not yet complete, the two volumes already published consisting of a series of essays by various authors, which are preliminary to a commentary upon *Acts*. The editors have contributed to the promotion of theological learning none the less because, as they say, they have been more anxious to state problems than to advance theories. Among the illuminating sections of vol. i. is one on Primitive Christianity, to which reference is made below; whilst in vol. ii. there are valuable discussions concerning the methods of early historians, and the difference in worth between the earlier and later parts of *Acts*, as well as other essays which must be mentioned later. A work of a more conservative character, which should be read by the side of these volumes, is Chase's *The Credibility of Acts*, for it is expedient that the subject should be presented from more than one standpoint.

The historical value of *Acts* depends upon a good many factors, one being the accuracy of the tradition which declares Luke to be the author, and a second (if the truth of the tradition be conceded) being the date at which the book was composed. On the first there is an exhaustive

argument in vol. ii. of *The Beginnings of Christianity*, the traditional view being defended by the late C. W. Emmet, whilst Luke's responsibility for *Acts* is denied by H. Windisch. Two important books, also relating to the authorship and date of *Acts*, are Harnack's *Luke the Physician*, and *The Date of Acts and the Synoptic Gospels*, 1911. On the linguistic relations between the Third Gospel and *Acts* reference should be made to Hawkins' *Horæ Synopticæ*, of which, originally published in 1899, there is a second edition. Formerly, as evidence that *St. Luke* and *Acts* were written by a physician (see *Col.* iv. 14), great stress was laid upon the occurrence, in these two works, of distinctive medical terms, the subject being treated by Hobart, *The Medical Language of St. Luke.* But recently this argument has been much shaken by Cadbury, *The Style and Literary Method of Luke*, who has shown that a number of the medical terms collected by Hobart are also found in non-medical works like the LXX. and the writings of Josephus. And it ought to be remembered that the determination of the question of the authorship of *Acts* in favour of Luke is not at once decisive for the historical value of the whole book. If Luke wrote it, we can of course place more confidence in the account of scenes at which he was himself present (the *we* passages [1] being assumed to come from his own diary) than would be possible if the book were the production of an entirely unknown author. But even an eye-witness can draw mistaken inferences from what he sees ; and as it is certain that Luke was not present at all the occasions that he reports, he must have been dependent upon other persons for information respecting many matters ; and the value of his accounts of such will rest partly upon the quality of the evidence available

[1] These are xvi. 10–17, xx. 5–16, xxi. 1–18, xxvii. 1–xxviii. 16. The Bezan MS. has a fifth (placed after xi. 27).

and partly upon his competence to sift and appraise it.

The volumes just surveyed are of the nature of *prolegomena* to the history of the primitive Church; and from them transition may be appropriately made to books professing to relate that history. Nevertheless, the historian cannot, even after embarking upon the actual course of his narrative, relieve himself of the duty of incidental criticism where the character of the original sources which he is using challenges it. And to this duty two historians of the Apostolic Age show themselves fully alive—Weizsäcker and McGiffert. The first, indeed, is not only critical but hypercritical, and seems more concerned to reject the representations of the writer of *Acts* than to replace them by more plausible explanations; so that if the reader whom he has rendered suspicious of what is reported in *Acts* desires a reconstruction (so far as is possible) of the real succession of events, he sometimes has to undertake it himself. McGiffert, in this respect, is much more satisfactory than the German writer. His conclusions will not always carry conviction; his chronology is inferior to that of C. H. Turner (in Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*); and his narrative is rather heavy and unattractive in style. Nevertheless, his work is a most useful one; and is, on the whole, the best of its kind with which the present writer is acquainted. Two others of more limited extent may also be mentioned. One is by J. V. Bartlet. This contains little criticism, but it supplies some account not only of various epistles comprised within the New Testament canon, but also of a few writings outside it, such as the *Didache* and the *Epistle of Barnabas*. The second is by J. H. Ropes, which, though too deficient in detail to suffice a student's needs, yet gives, in brief, a good idea of the circumstances conditioning the activity of the early Church, and of the principal stages in its development.

When a student, after the historical sources have been adequately examined and valued, and the sequence and true nature of the events recorded have been ascertained, wishes to realise in some degree the movement and colour of many of the scenes described, he will derive the greatest help from Ramsay's *St. Paul the Traveller*. Sir William Ramsay, who holds firmly that Luke wrote *Acts*, has an extremely high opinion of him as an historian, and believes that the narrative which he composed, and Paul's incidental references in his letters to many of the occurrences that figure in it, cannot but be substantially in agreement, though they may differ in particulars owing to the distinct aims of the two writers. Whether Ramsay's high estimate of Luke as an historical authority is justified or not, he is eminently qualified by his own experiences of travel in Asia Minor and elsewhere to be an illuminating commentator upon Luke's account of the Apostles' missionary journeys ; and the liveliness of his book arrests and holds the reader.

The theological development that took place during the Apostolic Age scarcely comes within the scope of the present paper. Nevertheless, though this is not the occasion for an enumeration of works on the subject, it will impart a certain compass and roundness to the list which is here being compiled if one or two are named. There is an extensive section in the aforementioned book, *The Beginnings of Christianity*, vol. i., where there is traced the divergence of early Christian thought in Jewish and Gentile circles, illustrated by the beliefs reached respecting the Spirit, the Church, and Baptism ; and it is concluded by a suggestive chapter on Christology. A thin volume, written by one of the editors of the last named work and entitled *Landmarks in Early Church History*, 1920, throws into relief certain turning-points in the evolution of Christian theology. But a very serious defect in Lake's estimate of the factors that

moulded the conviction entertained by the Apostles about their Lord is the little influence which he attributes to the Personality of Jesus. It is impossible to suppose that their thoughts about Him as Messiah and Saviour could have survived the terrible inference to which His ignominious death pointed (*Deut.* xxi. 23), had not His Personality during their intercourse with Him produced a profound impression upon them, and prepared them to trust subsequently the Resurrection visions. In connexion with the Christological beliefs of the primitive Church two useful books are A. H. McNeile's *New Testament Teaching in the Light of St. Paul's*, and H. A. A. Kennedy's *The Theology of the Epistles.*

As has already been said, dependence has to be placed upon the book of *Acts* alone for a continuous narrative of the period under consideration; and so the choice of a commentary becomes urgent. A commentary in which the historical worth of the varied contents of *Acts* is examined in a dispassionate and perfectly candid spirit has still to be written; and it may be hoped that the next volumes of *The Beginnings of Christianity* will supply the need. Meanwhile students can have recourse to R. J. Knowling's notes on the Greek text in the "Expositor's Greek Testament," and R. B. Rackham's on the Revised Version in the series of "Westminster Commentaries." There is also a conveniently handy volume in the "Century Bible," by J. V. Bartlet; whilst the edition of the Greek text by T. E. Page is very scholarly. In the use of these it is expedient not to lose sight of considerations that are brought to the front in some of the more critical works previously mentioned.

Of the books noticed above, the following may be selected as the Ten Best for the class of readers described :—

(1) Blass's *Acta Apostolorum.*

(2) Lake's, *The Early Epistles of St. Paul.*
(3) Foakes-Jackson's and Lake's *The Beginnings of Christianity,* Part I., vols. i. and ii.
(4) Weizsäcker's *The Apostolic Age.*
(5) McGiffert's *The Apostolic Age.*
(6) Chase's *The Credibility of Acts.*
(7) Ramsay's *St. Paul the Traveller and Roman Citizen.*
(8) Harnack's *Date of the Acts and the Synoptic Gospels.*
(9) McNeile's *New Testament Teaching in the Light of St. Paul's.*
(10) Knowling's or Rackham's *The Acts of the Apostles* (in the "Expositor's Greek Testament," vol. ii., and the "Westminster Commentaries" respectively).

G. W. Wade.

BIBLE AND KOR'AN.

Oh! East is East, and West is West, and never the twain shall meet,
Till Earth and Sky stand presently at God's great judgment seat.
(Rudyard Kipling, *Ballad of East and West.*)

This couplet is an epigram, and it is as true as many other epigrams. That is to say, it is only half-true. This vivid distinction between East and West needs serious qualification. The further assumption that the East is all one is false.

"East is East." Not at all. East is sometimes North East and sometimes it is South East. And if we take Syria the land of the Bible for the North East, and Arabia the land of the Kor'an for the South East, we are face to faec with a significant contrast. Syria is one of the highways of the world: the land in which from the remotest times the East and the West have met: there East and West

exchanged merchandise, and—a thing more precious than merchandise—language and thought. The names of her great cities mark routes of trade and thought running East and West, as Palmyra, Antioch, Damascus, Tyre, and Beyrout. Arabia on the other hand is a *barrier*, a torrid table-land on which men exist rather than live. To attempt to cross Arabia may mean to leave your own bones to whiten beside the bones of your camel.

The contrast between Syria and Arabia re-appears in the broad contrast which may be drawn between the Bible and the Kor'an. Syria is not one land, but an agglomeration of lands. It stretches from the border of Egypt in the South West to the Taurus range in the North, which divides it from Asia Minor ; in the North East it aligns itself along the Euphrates. It thus includes Palestine. We might almost call it a sub-continent of many peoples, nations, and languages. In early Biblical times there were Hebrews and Hittites ; Phœnicians, Philistines, and Aramæans ; ancient cave-dwellers and ancient and modern nomads. In later times there were Greeks and Greek half-castes and a sprinkling of Latins.

This variety in population was matched by variety in the physical features of the land. There was a long seaboard looking across the Mediterranean to the West. There were ancient trading cities inland. There were pasture-lands almost limitless and there was a considerable desert area. There were waters, streams or lakes, in unexpected places and dark green groves beside them. There are plains and there is Lebanon the great, the snow-white mountain-range. Syria in short is a land of variety. And from Syria, speaking generally, came our Bible, a book—for its size—perhaps the most varied in the world. It was written in two languages—or three, if you count Aramaic. And when you consider that one chief language is Hebrew

and the other Greek, you must confess that in a large sense East and West have indeed met, and met in most significant fashion between the covers of the Christian Bible.

Such is Syria. The story of Arabia is different. In extent it may be ten times the size of Syria, but it has none of the manifold variety of Syria. Sameness broods over all. We may dismiss briefly the Southern district which the Romans called Arabia Felix. We need not conjure up brilliant pictures because an English poet (who had not travelled in the East) could write of—

> "Sabaean odours from the spicy shores
> Of Araby the blest." [1]

Arabia as a whole may be described rather as—

> "A piece of red-hot sand
> With a palm on either hand."

It is not a white man's country, nor even a comfortable home for the dark-skinned man. Its products are camels, palms, coffee, a few precious horses, goats, and a few cows. In the Interior the population must wander, in order to live, from pasture to pasture. In fact the desert Arabs exist on the edge of starvation for a considerable part of the year. There are, it is true, a few towns (besides Mecca and Medina) in which a settled population lives, but the shadow of the immense empty desert is over all. The townspeople look down on the wandering Bedouin, but they have little justification for their contemptuous attitude. Neither the Town nor the Desert can boast of Art or Literature or of any ease of life. The Arabian peninsula with its 1,000,000 square miles, is a dreary empty starving land in which a scanty population of perhaps five millions cling sullenly to life, without imparting any beauty or variety to it.

This is the general impression we get from reading such

[1] *Paradise Lost*, iv. 162 f.

a modern book as C. M. Doughty's *Travels in Arabia Deserta*. It was in this rude empty burnt-up country that the Kor'an was born.

I need not say that it was not a bookish land. You have heard of ancient Arab poets doubtless, but their poems did not live in writing, but on the lips of reciters. Writing was a rare, strange, almost a magic art, like Reading. All the Education the Arab needed for his simple life was a little MENTAL ARITHMETIC. In Arabia writing was not used for the ordinary amenities of life, but for magic purposes. You did not write yourself, you got a special expert to do it for you, and often for mischief. With a line of writing you might cast an evil spell upon a foe, or (on the other hand) you might bring health to a sick friend, or (yet again) you might protect yourself from some spell which your foe would lay upon you. A book lay off the Highway of the Life of Arabia. Who could read it, nay, how many people dared touch it, for fear lest a dangerous spell was contained in it?

But in the history of the Kor'an the saying applies, *Omne ignotum pro magnifico*. Any piece of writing, much more a book, was a wonder to the great majority of Mohammed's countrymen. They heard with respect, perhaps with awe, that the Jews had a book, the *Taurah* (*Torah*), and indeed a second book, the Psalms. Similarly they knew that the Christians had a book the *Injil*, "evangel," or Gospel. But the Arabs of Mohammed's day probably never dreamed that they themselves were to possess a book which would be reckoned along with the Jewish Law and the Christian Gospel as one of the Sacred Books of the World.

It is one mark of the greatness of Mohammed (perhaps even of his sincerity) that he claimed to give his revelations out of a Sacred Book. It was a daring act. The prophet of Arabia spoke as one who was sure of his mission. By claiming to draw from a Divine Book he at once challenged

the two Great Book-religions, Judaism and Christianity. He set himself as a prophet beside Moses and Jesus.

But note that Mohammed's book in fact (like Mohammed's coffin in legend) was suspended between earth and heaven. Mohammed composed the Kor'an, but no written Kor'an existed in his lifetime. Our present recension dates from the Khalif Othman, the third in succession from the Prophet: it dates from about twenty-five years after the death of Mohammed. The really striking part of his claim is that the Kor'an was a truly heavenly book: it was preserved above on strips of silk, and these strips were shown or revealed to the prophet one by one. He learnt by heart each passage, and then the visionary silk was withdrawn. But the Kor'an obtained a wide circulation, though it was not written down. Mohammed's followers learnt chapters by heart and recited them to the heathen Arabs by way of propaganda. In 626 A.D. the Prophet sent a party of forty Moslems who were skilled in reciting the Kor'an to preach in Nejd. But some passages were written down. Thus in the story of the Conversion of Omar, afterwards the second in succession of the Khalifs, a loose leaf containing Sura (Chapter) XX plays the chief part. Omar was told that his sister and her husband had become followers of Mohammed, so armed with a sword he rushed off to their house. There he found another adherent of Mohammed teaching them to recite this Sura. He fell upon them, struck his brother-in-law, and in the scuffle his sister was wounded in the face. Then the impulsive Omar suffered a revulsion of feeling. He demanded to see what they had been reading, read the passage, admired it, and professed himself converted to Islam. But even in this story recitation plays a prominent part. Omar's sister and brother-in-law were learning Kor'an by heart when Omar so violently interrupted them.

The very name *Kor'an* means something "read aloud" or "recited"; and so the earliest passage revealed to Mohammed calls on him to read or recite that which he is shown in vision:

> "Recite in the name of thy Lord who created—
> Recite. Thy most beneficent Lord
> Who taught the use of the pen—
> Hath taught man that which he knew not." [1]

In these words (in brief) is Mohammed's claim. There is a heavenly book which he is learning by heart. He will recite it to groups of his followers, and thereby they will learn truths which neither he nor they knew before-time. By degrees the whole heavenly book will become known on earth, because the Prophet is learning it by heart to communicate it to the Believers.

A book preserved in heaven yet now copied in full and found in its thousands on earth—what is this book of wonderful origin like? Well, truly, most Western readers find it very dull, and it must certainly be confessed to be monotonous. The same themes constantly recur.

But we must consider the style of the Kor'an. It is a book which loses much by translation. It is composed not in verse, nor in ordinary prose, but in *rimed* prose, in lines of approximately equal length. When recited in its native Arabic it has a full and solemn sound. Its best passages are in a compressed style, but if we aim at a corresponding conciseness in English, the English reader will be at a loss for the meaning. Further, the Kor'an reports the daily controversial discussions of the Prophet with his Arabian opponents, and these are sometimes dark, and often wearisome.

Nor has the Kor'an been fortunate in its translators. George Sale is honest and accurate, but dull. J. M. Rodwell

[1] Kor'an XCVI.

is often better. Prof. Palmer is often excellent, but his work is uneven.

But there is no doubt that the Kor'an made a deep impression on Mohammed's generation. The Prophet offered the Arabs a sacred book in their own tongue. The story of Omar's conversion is only one of many testimonies to the power of the appeal of the Kor'an to the Arabs themselves. But the passage which made Omar a Moslem leaves the reader cold who reads it in Sale's translation.

It is from Sura (Chapter) XX :

"We send not down the Kor'an that thou mayest have sorrow,
But as a warning to the God-fearing,
It is sent down from Him who created the earth and the lofty heaven.
The Merciful is established upon the Throne;
To Him belongeth that which is in heaven and earth and that which is between them and that which is under the earth.
And if thou would'st pray with loud voice, remember that He knoweth that which is secret and well-hidden.
Allah! There is no other God but He; to Him belong the Beautiful Names."

This is a literal rendering of the passage, but an Arab would at once miss the rime or assonance with which each verse ends. An effort may be made even by one who is not a verse-maker, to represent the curious effect of the rime in this passage. Below is a rendering which is *not* literal, but reproduces the jingling endings of the first few verses. The same rime does in fact go on for 135 verses, but courage would fail to attempt further :

"Not to vex thee give we Kor'an in thy hand,
But for him who is pious as a warning command
From the Creator of Earth and Heaven's lofty strand.
See the Throne of the Merciful stand,
For He is lord of heaven, sea, sky, and land.
Cry not aloud, for He knoweth e'en secrets hid deep in the sand,
And to Him the sole God belong the Great Names in their glorious band."

After this introduction we find an abrupt offer to narrate the story of Moses, and, so *vv.* 8–99 tell, incidents from the life of Moses : the Burning Bush ; the Mission to Pharaoh ; the Birth of Moses ; the ark with the babe floating on the river, the long contendings with Pharaoh ; the Crossing of the Red Sea ; the manna and quails : the making of the Golden Calf " which lowed " for Israel to worship.

Vv. 100–111 describe the Day of Resurrection (Judgment).

Vv. 112–3 give a warning to the Prophet himself : " Be not over-hasty, before the revelation thereof (i.e. of the Kor'an) shall be completed unto thee, but say, *Lord, increase my knowledge.*"

Vv. 114–121 tell of the Fall of Adam and expulsion from the Garden.

Vv. 122 ff. contain an Admonition for the Meccans : their immunity from punishment means only that Allah gives them some respite.

Vv. 130 (Touching passage) Exhortation to the Prophet himself to be patient, and not to covet the prosperity of the Unbelievers.

This Sura, which contains 135 verses, may be taken as representative of the range of topics found in the Kor'an.

The Greatness of Allah, the Delights of Paradise, the Terrors of the Day of Resurrection, the excellence of the Kor'an, the certainty of the punishment of the Unbelievers, and finally re-assuring words for the Prophet himself—these and some stories from the Old Testament make up the greatest part of the Arab Scripture. For a single chapter there is a good deal of variety, and yet the Kor'an as a whole is a monotonous book. The topics which we found in Sura XX occur again and again in other Suras.

It is (we cannot forget) a One-man book. While the Old and New Testaments have many authors, the Kor'an

has Mohammed only. It could hardly help being monotonous, for though Mohammed began as a Poet, he soon became just a Preacher, and he came from a dry and dreary land. He even made things monotonous which before had been full of life and movement. Thus he took the stories of the Old Testament, e.g. those of Noah, Abraham, Joseph, Moses and Solomon, and dared to re-tell them. He was not successful in this rash adventure. He added aprocyphal details which he learnt no doubt from the Jews who were settled in north Arabia, but he failed to add any freshness to the old narratives. On the contrary as a preacher he put some of the dulness of his preaching into the mouths of the Patriarchs. He makes them talk like good Moslems, and sometimes they actually declare that their religion is Islam. And once at least we get such a passage as this :

"O ye people of the Scripture, why do ye argue concerning Abraham ? . . . Abraham was not a Jew, nor a Nazarene, but he was orthodox, a Moslem, and not a worshipper of many gods." [1]

Before passing to a formal comparison between the Bible and the Kor'an we should notice one immense service to the cause of Religion which the Arab Scripture has performed. No doubt the Kor'an falls behind both the Old Testament and the New in religious and moral worth. But let the Prophet of Islam have his due. He did nobly maintain the Unity and the Greatness of God, and millions in Asia are the better to-day because of his preaching. Further, he did hold up a higher standard of conduct than the Arabs had known before him.

On the moral side there are passages in the Kor'an of real value. But it must be added that even such passages are often interrupted by a jarring note. Thus in Sura XVII is a notable passage which reminds us of the Decalogue. Here are some phrases from it :

[1] Kor'an iii 58 ff.

"Set not up another god with God lest thou sit thee down disgraced, helpless."

"Thy Lord hath ordained . . . kindness to parents . . . Say not unto them, *Fie* . . . but speak to them both with respectful speech. And defer humbly to them out of tenderness."

"And to him who is of kin render his due, and also to the poor and to the wayfarer; yet waste ye not wastefully. For the wasteful are brethren of the Satans."

"Kill not your children for fear of want. . . . Verily the killing of them is great wickedness."

"Have nought to do with fornication; for it is a foul thing and an evil way."

"Neither slay any one whom God hath forbidden you to slay, unless for a just cause. . . ."

"And touch not the substance of the orphan, unless in an upright way."

"And give full measure, when you measure. . . . This will be better, and fairest for settlement."

"And walk not proudly on the earth, for thou canst not cleave the earth" (*vv.* 23–29).

This is a very noble passage. It is haunted however by two ghosts. Two facts of Mohammed's life well known to Moslems must have limited the application of these precepts. The prohibition of fornication was not inconsistent (if the prophet's example be followed) with great sexual license. The prohibition of slaughter yet allowed the Moslem to put men and women to death very freely, provided that they could be described as "the enemies of God."

A second striking passage of moral contents is found in Sura XXIII. 1 ff.:

"Blessed are the Believers,
Who humble themselves in Prayer,
Who turn away from lewd talk,
Who do alms deeds,
Who guard their bodies in purity
Save for their wives and for their slaves. . . .
Who observe their trusts and their covenants."

Again, a noble passage but for the permission of polygamy and of co-habitation with slaves. Thereby it misses the Christian standard.

Thus we may say that there is a marked difference between Mohammed the Theologian standing absolutely for the Unity and Greatness of Allah, and Mohammed the Moralist. As a Moralist he is no doubt "on the side of the angels," but we do not hear a quite decided note when he speaks of moral duties. Then we are impressed rather with his moderation, his good sense. He appears as the Statesman who wants to keep his people within bounds of average decency, and not as the Teacher of Righteousness.

When we turn to the Bible we get something morally great which we miss in the Kor'an. Even the Old Testament supplies this. No doubt much of the morality of the Old Testament is merely tribal. The Christian finds positive faults and (on the negative side) serious gaps in Hebrew morality. But, on the other hand, there are flashes of white-heat of moral indignation from the Hebrew Scripture, which it would be a moral calamity to lose. Here we miss something in the Arab Scripture. In the Kor'an Mohammed tells the story of Joseph and Potiphar's wife with added details, almost as though he would dwell on it. In Genesis "Moses" passes swiftly through the story, leaving to stand out in the memory only the indignant protest, "How shall I do this great wickedness, and sin against God?"[1] And it is in the Hebrew Scripture that David, the darling of the Hebrew people, stands out shamed and confounded with the rebuke, "*Thou* art the man. . . . Therefore the sword shall not depart from thy house for ever." The Hebrews, again, were no doubt given to bloodshed, but it is in the Hebrew Scripture that the story of the Syrians surprised in the midst of Samaria is told. "The king of Israel said unto Elisha, *My Father, shall I smite them, shall I smite?* And he answered, *Thou shalt not smite them. Wouldest thou smite those whom thou hast taken captive with thy sword*

[1] Gen. xxxix. 9.

and with thy bow? Set food and drink before them, and let them eat and drink and so go to their Master."[1] From the Hebrew Prophets we might heap up instances of such burning words spoken for the right, but two will suffice. You will remember—you cannot forget—Isaiah's condemnation of the Earth-hunger of the wealthy: "Woe unto you that join house to house, that lay field to field, till there be no room, and ye can dwell by yourselves in the midst of the land."[2] And one passage out of many from Amos:

"Ye that put away the thought of the evil day,
And love to oppress men by forms of law;
Who lie upon beds of ivory, . . .
And eat the fatted calf;
Who sing a catch to the sound of the viol,
Who drink wine by the bowl-full,
And use the finest ointment,
But have no care for the wounds of Joseph." [3]

I draw contrasts from the Old Testament because it seems hardly fair to confront Mohammed's well-meant moral exhortations with the creative power of the Sermon on the Mount or with St. Paul's Panegyric on Love.

The greatness of Mohammed does not lie in his moral teaching. He was, like Luther, a man of one idea. Luther stood with memorable firmness for the doctrine of Salvation by Faith alone. Mohammed in like fashion stood for the doctrine of Salvation obtained by the confession of the Unity of God. But Mohammed's stedfastness was even more admirable than Luther's, because he sprang from one of the most fickle and wayward peoples on the earth. The Arabs, as Doughty saw them in 1876–8, were almost inconceivably infirm of purpose. They never continued in one stay. They promised and forgot their promises; they threatened and suddenly changed to a smile. A little

[1] 2 Kings vi. 21.
[2] Isa. v. 8.
[3] Amos vi. 3–6.

stedfastness on the part of a lonely unarmed European was enough to turn them from their purpose. Rudyard Kipling's description of the Bandar Log might have been meant for them.

But Mohammed stood like a rock amid shifting sand. He first conquered his countrymen, and then he led them. His well-known answer to his uncle, Abu Tālib, when he was urged for the sake of his clan—a powerful appeal to an Arab—to give up his preaching, is thoroughly characteristic of the man. "Were the sun to come down on my right hand and the moon on my left, and the choice were offered me of abandoning my mission or perishing in the achievement of it, I would not abandon it."[1]

Mohammed was in this deadly earnest because he himself believed in the Paradise (*el-jannah*, "the Garden") and Gehenna (*Jahannam*) which he preached. The language of the Kor'an is frightful. "Thou shalt see the sinners on that day bound together in the fetters: their inner garments shall be of pitch, and fire shall cover their faces."[2] And again, "The fruit of the tree of Ez-Zakḳūm shall be the food of the sinner: like the dregs of oil it shall boil in the belly. It shall be said, Take ye him and drag him to the midst of hell: then pour upon his head tormenting boiling water."[3] Equally realistic, on the other side, are the terms in which the pleasures of Paradise are set forth. "The sincere servants of God shall have a certain provision of fruits in the gardens of delight upon couches opposite one to another. A cup shall be carried round unto each of them from a flowing spring, white, delicious to the drinkers. . . . And beside them shall be modest wives, having large and beautiful eyes and a skin as fair as the eggs of the ostrich."[4] And, again, "Beneath the gardens shall

[1] T. W. Arnold, *Preaching of Islam*, p. 13.
[2] Sura xiv. 50 f. [3] Sura xliv. 43 f. [4] Sura xxxvii. 39 ff.

run rivers; the believers shall be adorned therein with bracelets of gold; they shall wear green raiment of fine brocade and of thick brocade, reclining therein on thrones." [1]

Passages such as these are not infrequent in the Kor'an. There can be little doubt that Mohammed took such threats and promises in the literal sense.

In all this the Kor'an stands in contrast to the Bible. To consider the Old Testament first, the Hebrew Scriptures contain no doctrine of a future Heaven and Hell. Indeed the intimations of a future life found there are both few and faint. So we may conclude that there is no indication of a Hell of torment, even in the grim words of Isaiah lxvi. 24. The rebellious dead in that passage suffer no living pain; only the horrible sight of their corpses is a standing lesson and a warning to the living.

Nor, again, can Daniel xii. 2, a passage of singular reticence, be stretched to contain such a detailed doctrine of the Day of Resurrection as the Kor'an sets forth again and again. The Hebrew prophet is content to say, "Many of those that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to æonian life and some to reproach, to æonian abhorrence."

When we turn to the New Testament (outside the Book of the Revelation) we find the case much the same. There are many references to future Rewards and Punishments, but these are commonly made either in the course of parables, or at least in parabolic language. The language is varied, and one metaphor succeeds another. There is no fixed doctrine of Hell. The name Gehenna is used, but the Kor'anic picture of Jahannam is not given.

The most noteworthy fact is the reticence of detail which prevails in the New Testament as to future punishment. There is a mention of fire, and of æonian fire, it is true, but the Kor'anic details of the sufferings of sinners in the fire

[1] Sura xviii. 30.

are absent. The language both of the Gospels and of the Pauline Epistles is stern enough, but it is uncoloured and unlaboured. The main punishment suggested is that of exclusion from the Presence of God or from the Marriage Feast of the Lamb.

So also with regard to future reward. Apart from the parabolic description of the New Jerusalem in the Apocalypse, no picture of Paradise is given in the New Testament. But, on the other hand, the Apocalypse itself contains promises of reward for the righteous which are better than anything contained in the Kor'an. Of the faithful, the Lord proclaims, "They shall walk with me in white." Of the new Jerusalem to which they shall be admitted it is said, "The throne of God and of the Lamb shall be therein: and his servants shall do him service: and they shall see his face." This promise of communion with God and his Christ is better than any promise of the Kor'an. The Moslem is taught to look for Heaven, not for the Divine Presence.

Yet we may confess that Mohammed had a commission from God to teach an elementary religion to peoples and tribes who were not capable of receiving more advanced teaching. Certainly the Christians of Syria and Egypt who were conquered soon after the Prophet's death were fallen from pure Christianity and were unable to give to the idolaters of Arabia a religion better than their own. Both on the doctrinal and on the moral side the followers of Jesus had become unfaithful. Athanasius and his adherents had taught the doctrine of *Trinity in Unity* in the fourth century, but by the beginning of the seventh the doctrine of the Unity had become grievously obscured. In part this was due to an incautious cult of the Blessed Virgin, which had been growing for two centuries in popularity. It became widely believed among the heathen that

Christians worshipped not one God but three, the three being the Father, Jesus the Son, and the Virgin herself. Hence, it is written in the Kor'an :

" When God shall say on the day of resurrection, O Jesus, son of Mary, hast thou said unto men, Take me and my mother as two deities beside God,—Jesus shall answer, Far be such a dishonour from Thee ! " [1]

It is not surprising that non-Christians should have thus accused Christians of being polytheists, when we read the language actually used by the Eastern emperor Heraclius in 628 A.D. (four years before Mohammed's death) in announcing to the people of Constantinople his victory over the Persian king Chosroes. Heraclius, after reciting Psalm c. as a thanksgiving, proceeds to say :

" Chosroes the presumptuous, the hater of God is fallen, he who exalted himself . . . against our Lord Jesus Christ the true God and against His spotless mother, our blessed Lady who brought forth God yet remained ever-virgin (*θεοτόκου καὶ ἀειπαρθένου.*)

And again :

" We announce how God and our Lady who brought forth God worked with (*συνέπραξεν*) us and our Christ-loving armies beyond all that man could imagine."

And, finally :

" And so we have cheerful confidence towards our Lord Jesus Christ the clement and almighty God and towards our Lady who brought forth God that they will guide all our affairs in accordance with their clemency." [2]

Can we be surprised as we read such language that the Arabian prophet supposed that the Virgin was reckoned by Christians as one of the Ever-Blessed Trinity ? Have we any right to be indignant if Moslems believe that Christians associate " other gods " with God ? Had not Mohammed good reason for calling us polytheists—worshippers of more gods than one ? The incautious language

[1] Sura v. 116.

[2] *Chronicon Paschale* (Bonnae, 1832), vol. 1, p. 727 ff.

which is sometimes used about the Blessed Virgin is, in fact, dangerous. Had Christians followed the example of the reserve of the New Testament writers on this subject, we should not have been open to attack in the pages of the Kor'an.

Unfortunately it was not only on the doctrinal side, but also on the moral side that Christianity was weak in Mohammed's day. The theological controversies of three centuries had done double harm to the Church. In the first place they had to a large extent destroyed the sense of brotherhood between Christian and Christian. In the second place they had turned the Church aside from the pursuit of the Christian life to waste her strength on endless dogmatic discussion. The great Moslem triumph over Christian peoples does surely illustrate the warning given 600 years before by our Lord : " The kingdom of God shall be taken away from you, and shall be given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof." Christians were not bringing forth the fruits of the Gospel, and so were worthy of chastisement. The early Moslems, on the other hand, had good fruits to show; they feared God, kept their word and used charity towards their brethren.

Among the four chief duties of religion as taught in the Kor'an is Prayer. Prayer is there taught by example as well as by precept. Indeed, the first Sura of the book is a prayer which is recited not only daily, but several times a day. It is as follows :

" In the name of God the Compassionate, the Merciful. Praise be to God the Lord of the Worlds, the Compassionate, the Merciful, the King of the Day of Judgment. Thee only do we worship, and of Thee only do we seek for help. Guide us in the right way, the way of those to whom Thou showest favour, not of those with whom Thou art angry, nor of those who go astray."

A second prayer, given in Sura II, verse 256, is also used in the daily devotions, though not by all Moslems. It is called the Verse of the Throne, and is much admired :

" Allah, there is no God but He, the Living, the Everlasting. Slumber overtaketh Him not, nor sleep. To Him belongeth whatsoever is in the heavens and whatsoever is in the earth. Who is he who shall intercede with Him, save by His permission ? He knoweth what was before, and what cometh after ; and none shall comprehend aught of His knowledge, save as He willeth. His throne is a canopy over the heavens and the Earth, and the keeping of them is no burden to Him ; for He is the Most High, the Almighty."

These two prayers are worthy of some study. The first of them is readily recognised as a prayer : it is addressed to God ; and it is singularly comprehensive, as, indeed, true prayer tends to become. It begins with an Ascription, " Praise be to God " ; it continues with an act of devotion, " Thee do we worship " ; it ends with petition, but petition on the grand scale, " Guide us in the right way." There is, it seems, no impatient clamour for some particular earthly boon. The prayer is spiritual.

The second instance, quoted above, is a prayer in substance but not in form. It is a meditation on the Greatness of God : it is thoughtful praise. On the positive side the actual contents of the two Kor'anic prayers give no handle to hostile criticism. But it must be confessed that a richer vein of prayer is to be found in the Bible.

As regards the New Testament it is enough to say that it contains the Lord's Prayer. But the Old Testament also contains great prayers, such as the prayer ascribed to Solomon at the Dedication of the Temple. The occasion was special, but the prayer has a universal character. It is a pattern of devotion and of supplication.

It opens like the Kor'an with an ascription of praise to God (1 Kings viii. 23). Solomon said :

"O JEHOVAH the God of Israel, there is no god like Thee in heaven above or earth beneath ; who keepest covenant and mercy.

But will God in very deed dwell on the earth ? behold heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain thee ; how much less this house that I have builded ! "

Then the prayer turns into petition : it becomes a kind of Litany full of human touches :

" When thy people Israel are smitten before the enemy, because they sin against Thee ; if they turn again . . . and pray in this house : then hear Thou in heaven, and forgive. . . .

When there is no rain because they sin against Thee ; if they pray towards this place, and turn from their sin . . . then hear Thou in heaven, and forgive. . . .

If there be in the land pestilence, blasting, or mildew, or locust . . . every prayer of every man who shall spread forth his hands towards this house . . . then hear Thou in heaven, and forgive. . . .

Moreover, as for the stranger, who is not of Thy people Israel, when he shall come and pray towards this house . . . then hear Thou in heaven Thy dwelling place, and do according to all the cry of the stranger."

They are extracts only, but they are enough to show that 1 Kings viii. 23–53, has the characteristics of a great prayer : its note of praise is lofty ; its sympathy is human ; its sense of sin is true ; its appeal is comprehensive ; in all difficulties the resource is to the one God. There is no suggestion that for some special need the help of some other God or spirit may avail.

But we cannot touch the subject of Prayer in the Old Testament without thinking of the Psalter. All the chief elements of Prayer are found here—Adoration, Praise, Thanksgiving, Meditation, Confession, Petition. The Kor'an, as I have said, also contains Prayers—prayers, indeed, of a high order. But there is no wealth of Prayer in the Kor'an to compare with the contents of the Psalter. Once more it must be confessed that the Arab Bible is found wanting.

Christian charity will not wish to dwell on the defects of the Kor'an ; rather Christian love of truth will confess that God did not leave Himself without witness in the arid land of Arabia. But Christians cannot forget that while Mohammed pays lip-service to our Lord as "a prophet," he shows no sense of the unique significance of the person of Jesus. The Kor'an introduces the name of our Lord only for the sake of an anti-Christian polemic. It describes Him as an "Apostle to the children of Israel," who undertook to give life to birds formed of clay and promised to heal the blind and the leper and to raise the dead. He did not die on the Cross : he was crucified only in appearance. In Islam there is only a legendary Jesus.

In the Gospels, on the other hand, Jesus is an historical figure for all but hypercritics. And of this figure we are driven to confess, "A greater than Mohammed is here." His moral precepts are unqualified by concessions to human weakness. The standard is kept high. And the Christ is consistent throughout. With much in the political conditions of the time to tempt him—almost to compel him—to appeal to the sword, he refused to use the external force of steel against men's bodies, and still more to use the internal force of thaumaturgy against men's minds and consciences.[1] The last word of the Kor'an is, "Kill those who join other gods with Allah, wherever ye shall find them."[2] The last words of the Gospel are, "Put up thy sword into its sheath," *and* "My kingdom is not of this world ; if it were of this world, then would my disciples be fighting, but now is my kingdom not from hence."[3]

W. Emery Barnes.

[1] Matt. xvi. 1–4. [2] Kor'an ix. 5.
[3] John xviii. 11, 36.

THE BOOK OF JOB AND THE EARLY PERSIAN PERIOD.

The early Persian period really begins with the capture of Babylon by Cyrus the Persian in 538 B.C. In order, however, fully to grasp the subsequent history of the Jews, and, as I think, of our author, we must go back a few years, namely to the year 553, when Cyrus first emerged as the leader of the various Persian clans, and to the battle of Pasargadæ in 550, when he became ruler of the Median empire, and transferred his government to the Median capital at Ecbatana.

The position of the Jews in the Babylonian empire at this time is witnessed to by many direct hints. Under Nebuchadrezzar they had enjoyed a considerable amount of peace and prosperity. Jeremiah's well-known advice:

> Build ye houses, and dwell in them; and plant gardens, and eat the fruit of them; take ye wives and beget sons and daughters; and take wives for your sons and give your daughters to husbands, that they may bear sons and daughters; that ye may be increased there and not diminished; and seek the peace of the city whither I have caused you to be carried away captives—

had been followed in very large measure. The original numbers of those transported from Judea, mainly in 597 and 586 B.C., i.e., between four and five thousand, had largely increased. In a country of rich alluvial soil, where political security and the high development of agriculture and commerce offered every encouragement, the well-known fertility of the race, backed by their hygienic customs, care of infant life, and encouragement of healthy marriage, secured a rapid increase, just as has happened to Anglo-Saxon immigrants into the Mississippi basin within the last century. At the same time the continued imprisonment of the last Davidic king, Jehoiachin, offered for a long time no en-

couragement to those who looked for the ultimate re-establishment of a Judæan kingdom in Jerusalem under a Messianic (and of course therefore a Davidic) king. And consequently, when Evil-Merodach, on his accession in 561, released Jehoiachin from captivity and made him a pensioner of the royal household, thus acknowledging his status as a dependent prince of the empire, Jewish hopes rose again. For this treatment of him whom they continued to regard as their true leader and anointed ruler seemed tantamount to an acknowledgment that they were themselves still thought of as a national group. Hope revived, and they began to look forward once more to a restoration to their native soil and former status. This was the gospel which, under Evil-Merodach, began to be preached in the little communities of the faithful, known already amongst themselves as *the remnant* (השארית) who, inspired and directed by the teaching of Baruch and of Ezekiel, had for nearly a quarter of a century been meeting regularly in their synagogues, had kept up their native Hebrew tongue, and had preserved, studied and extended the ancient legends of their race, the elements of their law, and the writings of the earlier prophets. Doubtless there were very many who had become, or were rapidly becoming, absorbed in the surrounding Babylonian population. Nevertheless the שארית formed a by no means inconsiderable number of persons. Their adherence was the result, on the whole, of individual personal conviction in each case, since it was by the highly individualist teaching of Ezekiel that they had been roused and converted to fresh hope instead of the pessimism which had resulted from their first belief that they were the objects of Yahweh's hereditary vengeance. These Jews of the remnant, then, consisted of individual converts, practising an instructional and hortatory rather than an emotional worship, highly

literate and devoted to their own sacred literature, and cherishing the hope of an ultimate return to their own country under the leadership of a Messianic and Davidic king.

The first mention of the Persians in Hebrew sources occurs about this time. Ezekiel knew the Persians, Ethiopians and Lybians, פרש, כוש and פוט, as enemies of the Babylonian power before 572. It would seem that Cyrus first came to the throne as a semi-independent prince somewhere east of Persepolis. He succeeded in uniting his own clan with six others of kindred descent around Pasargadæ as a centre. The six incorporated tribes furnished in their royal dynasties the six families of peers who held privileged rank in the Achæmenid empire—as witness Herodotus, III. 70–71 :—

Ὀτάνης μέν νυν εἰσάγεται Ἰνταφέρνεα· Γωβρύης δὲ Μεγάβυζον. Ἀσπαθίνης δὲ Ὑδάρνεα. γεγονότων δὲ τούτων ἓξ, παραγίνεται . . . Δαρεῖος . . . ἐόντες ἑπτὰ . . .

and Aeschylus, Persæ, 956–960 :—

ποῦ δέ σοι παραστάται Δοτάμας ἠδ' Ἀγδαβάτας, Ψάμμις,
οἷος ἦν Φαρανδάκης Σουσισκάνης τ'
Σούσας, Πελάγων Ἀγβάτανα λιπών.

In 550 the battle of Pasargadæ resulted in the transfer of the Median empire in its entirety to the Achæmenid line of Persian rulers, and Cyrus established his capital at Ecbatana. For, as Delattres points out, witness is borne to the Persian character of the Achæmenid empire by the unanimous tradition of both Hellenes and Hebrews. The opposite theory involves the hypothesis that the Persians conquered the empire of Susians or Medes, and supplanted them subsequently to the reign of Cyrus.

The battle of Pasargadæ was succeeded by a period of twelve years fateful in the extreme for the Jewish com-

munities in Babylonia. The hopes raised by the release of Jehoiachin, and the meed of recognition which continued to be accorded to him under the successor of Evil-Merodach and until his death, seem to have roused amongst the Jews an enthusiasm which was soon regarded with grave suspicion by the Babylonian Government. Under Nabuna'id, who began his reign in 556, Babylonia found herself threatened on all sides—on the east by Medes and Persians; on the west by Ethiopians and Egyptians, who were constantly on the alert to stir up rebellion among the Edomites and Arabs of Palestine and the Phœnicians of Northern Syria. It is no wonder that the Jewish prophets who preached a return to Palestine and taught their people to hope for the creation there of an independent state, did so at the risk of imprisonment and of execution. And as the Persians grew steadily in power and Cyrus and his armies loomed ever larger on the Babylonian horizon, so did the position of those Jews who remained loyal to their past traditions and their Messianic hopes become constantly more unsafe. The more these hopes began to fix themselves on Cyrus, the more did those who entertained them come into bad odour with the Babylonians. And during the last years before 538, when some of the Jews—there can be little doubt—were actually in correspondence with the Persians, their whole existence became perilous in the extreme, and trebly so that of the brave men who continued with the utmost courage to exhort their brethren and to announce the approaching deliverance and restoration of their people. That many—like Esther and Mordecai a hundred years later—were cosmopolitan in their sympathies, and had little enthusiasm for this return and restoration, there can be no doubt. But there were very many faithful. One, at least, of the leaders actually suffered the extreme penalty. He has become immortal in the Servant Songs of his poet-

disciple, which the latter subsequently incorporated in his clarion call to his countrymen, a call in which the dead martyr's message lived again in the words of his follower.[1] Many of the hero's compatriots, it is true, dissociated themselves from his extreme attitude—

> We hid, as it were, our faces from him; he was despised, and we esteemed him not—

and thus saved their own lives and reputations. Nevertheless, his work was done. For good or ill, the Babylonian power which destroyed that nameless but immortal spirit, and which his friend denounces with such depth of feeling—

> xlvii. 3, 9. Sit thee silent and get thee into darkness, O daughter of the Chaldeans, for thou shalt no more be called the lady of kingdoms. . . . But these two shall come to thee in a moment, in one day, the loss of children and widowhood—

was herself destroyed, and the bond between Jews and Persians was forged which was to influence history for nearly two centuries. The protection and favour shown to the Hebrews by the Persian rulers, and witnessed to by the papyri in the case of Cambyses, can have been due to nothing else than the recognition of help received from Babylonian Jews during the years preceding the taking of Babylon. It was, as we know, directly due to this protection that the New Judaism was permanently founded more than 100 years later by Nehemiah and by his brother Hananiah, under the *ægis* of Artaxerxes I, and later by Ezra under Artaxerxes II.

How great was the suffering of the Jews of the שארית during the last years of the Babylonian government is mirrored for us in the imperishable pages which describe those who walk in darkness and have no dawn, who have

[1] This is at least a very attractive interpretation. Of the many others current, Prof. Sellin's suggestion that we are dealing with the historical tradition of a martyred Moses, seems best to fulfil the conditions.

kindled a fire and walk in its sparks, whose necessary portion is sorrow.

> Who is among you that feareth the Lord,
> that obeyeth the voice of his servant,
> that walketh in darkness and hath no light?
> Behold, all ye that kindle a fire,
> that compass yourselves about with sparks;
> Walk in the light of your fire,
> and in the sparks ye have kindled.
> This shall ye have of mine hand;
> ye shall lie down in sorrow.

To the faithful the words of this great poet and prophet (Isa. l. 10, 11) were thrice-inspired. Their children were brought up to know every line by heart, not only of Deutero-Isaiah, but of the records of God's salvation in the past on which that leader based his faith. The return to the promised land was to be a repetition of the salvation already granted to Noah, to Abraham, to David.[1] Once from the waste of waters, twice from bondage through a long journey across the desert, had Yahweh already delivered his people.

The enthusiasts, then, who made up the caravans which undertook the weary traverse of the steppe in response to the permission of the Persian government, set out with the cadences of the Second Isaiah making constant music in their ears. And amongst these was, as I think, the author of our poem, a poem largely autobiographical, for which reason I shall henceforward take the liberty of referring to the poet himself by the name which he gave to his hero.

Job, then, was a young Jew, devout, wealthy, high-minded, whose family was of much consequence in the Babylonian community, one of those leading houses, probably, of whose overbearing conduct in some instances Ezekiel had found reason to complain a generation and more

[1] Isa. li. 2; liv. 9; lv. 3.

previously. The members of this particular family, however, were enthusiastic partakers of the Messianic hope, and earnest followers and supporters of the Second Isaiah and his friends. I shall strive to show, in so far as the limits of this paper permit, how profoundly the language of the later poem shows the influence of the Second Isaiah's writings both in diction, phrasing and imagery.

Some time after the Persian occupation of Babylon, perhaps about 530, the writer of our poem gave up his position in Babylonia, realised most of his resources, and threw in his lot with one of the caravans which set out—as it seems—on several different occasions to cross the desert to the Holy Land. Fired with the high hopes of youth and filled with the enthusiasm inspired by his great master, Job confidently expected a glorious future under the Messianic king who governed the territory allotted by the Persian emperor to the returned exiles. His hopes were doomed to disappointment. The temple was indeed completed, but the Davidic king, instead of becoming a world-ruler, the earthly representative of a world-ruling Creator, was superseded by a Persian officer, himself the subordinate of the satrap of Syria. Things went from bad to worse. The wars with Greece and with Egypt, resulting from the Ionic and Egyptian revolts, drained every district alike of men and of money. Finally the defeat of Xerxes at Salamis and Platea had its fearful reactions in the Syrian province. The once wealthy and enthusiastic young Jewish noble is found at the end of his life stripped alike of riches, position, and all that once made life so pleasant, the tenant of a tiny cottage of clay[1]—children, possessions, servants, everything was lost to him, and what was bitterest of all, his hopes for his country's future were shattered. The virgin of Israel had fallen to

[1] בתי חמר. See Job iv. 19.

rise no more. In his old age he wrestles with his doubts; the fine optimism of his great teacher, the Deutero-Isaiah, has been proved utterly groundless; the three friends represent the older solution, that of individual responsibility, the teaching of Ezekiel, upon which indeed the particularism as well as the moral conscience of the synagogue convert was based. Both these solutions are rejected by Job. They do not represent facts. Nor can he find comfort in that deeper teaching of the Second Isaiah, the doctrine of vicarious suffering. However true it may be in certain cases, it is not sufficient as a general explanation. And finally he takes refuge in that sublime faith which has been the support of many of the greatest souls since his time—faith in the inscrutable sovereignty of God.

Having then committed ourselves to this explanation of the poem, it behoves us to suggest as much as may be in the way of support for it, and the following lines are those which seem to offer the most obvious possibilities.

In the first place the literary and linguistic affinities between Job and Deutero-Isaiah must be touched on. Secondly, references in the poem or in the introduction to material situations such as would occur in the kind of career here attributed to our author, should be compared with similar references to social, political or economic conditions in contemporary writers, notably Haggai and Zechariah. Thirdly, any references in the poem which suggest a Babylonian education and early upbringing or Zoroastrian influences will assist the theory; are there signs, for instance, of Rabbinic instruction received in the schools of the gōlāh? Fourthly, do the theological positions assumed by the various characters correspond to the views which we have attributed to the real Job and to his friends? Lastly, what independent evidence, if any, is offered by the language of the poem itself?

Before devoting a few pages to these inquiries it will be well to outline the history of the returned exiles up to just after the year of Platea, 479 B.C., when, or somewhat earlier, we are inclined to date the final redaction of the poem.[1]

When Cyrus, in 538 B.C., gave permission to the Babylonian Jews to return to their old country, it was as a semi-independent principate, under a native prince or נָשִׂיא,[2] who would also rank as official governor, that he intended them to take up life in their former home. The two first Achæmenid emperors carried on their empire on the lines of their Babylonian and Assyrian predecessors. The division of the whole realm into close satrapies was the work of Darius Hystaspes, and only came into being after the troubles which marked the opening of his long and prosperous reign. I here tread on somewhat dangerous ground and shall inevitably leave behind me many fragments of opposite theories. Without stopping *en route* to account for all these I proceed. The first ruler, then, of the returned exiles was Sheshbazzar, or, to give him his real name, Sin-bal-uṣur, the son of the Davidic king Jehoiachin, who had died an honourable pensioner of the Babylonian government. We cannot identify Sheshbazzar with his nephew and successor, the more famous Zerubbabel ben Sh'altiel, whom we find installed in his uncle's place at the beginning of the reign of Darius Hystaspes. Zerubbabel is indeed described by Haggai—an authority here of the first value—as פחת יהודה. But he was not merely פחה as were Nehemiah, Sanballat, Bagoas (Bigvai) and others under later emperors. Sheshbazzar and Zerubbabel

[1] The suggestion of Sellin that the *Book of Job*, like *Faust*, is the result of many years' work, and that the author himself made considerable later additions to his first copy, is extremely attractive.

[2] Ezra i. 8, שֵׁשְׁבַּצַּר הַנָּשִׂיא לִיהוּדָה; cf. Ezek. xxxiv. 24, ועבדי דוד נשיא בתוכם.

were native princes, and considered as such both by their people and by the government at Susa, although they held the rank of and exercised the powers of a פֶּחָה.[1] Their position was analogous to that in Tyre under the Neo-Babylonian government, when the city was ruled for some time by שפטים, but later, as we know from Josephus, by a scion of the old local royal house, *Μέρβαλος*, who was succeeded by a similar personage, *Εἴρωνος*.[2]

The first group of exiles who returned with Sheshbazzar held authority from Cyrus to rebuild the temple. But they found it impossible to do so. It was not until the time of Zerubbabel that the work was really taken in hand under the leadership of the high priest Joshua ben Jozadaq and the inspiration of Haggai and Zechariah. A succession of rebellions and revolts all over the empire had just then followed the death of Cambyses. To Haggai and Zechariah these were the signs of the end of Persian rule and the beginning of the Messianic kingdom. The completion of the temple would, they taught, herald the coming of Yahweh in power and the establishment of Zerubbabel as his divinely appointed ruler in a regenerated world. But these were dangerous doctrines to preach in public. Politically, both Haggai and Zechariah were more than indiscreet. Haggai, it will be remembered, makes Yahweh say:

"I will overthrow the throne of kingdoms and will destroy the strength of the kingdoms of the heathen; and I will overthrow the chariots and those that ride in them, and the horses and their riders shall come down. . . . I will take thee, O Zerubbabel, and will make thee a signet. . . ." (Hag. ii. 22, 23).

Zechariah must have been an equally embarrassing sup-

[1] In Ezek. xlvi. 2 the functions of חה and מלך seem both to be comprehended in the נשיא. This passage, according to Prof. G. A. Cooke (*Z.A.T.* for 1924), is an early draft for the P document, and represents the restored state as pictured by the exiled Jewish leaders.

[2] Jos. c. Ap. I. 21.

porter for a prince who held his position by the grace of a foreign suzerain.

"He spake, saying . . . these are come . . . to cast out the horns of the Gentiles. Behold the man whose name is the Branch . . . he shall bear the glory and shall sit and rule upon his throne" (Zech. i. 21; vi. 12).

The government of Darius was not destined to provide a fulfilment of these daring prophecies. The new emperor's vigorous campaigns reduced his rebellious subjects one after another, and he proceeded to reorganise the whole empire. The plan he adopted reminds us of the Diocletian reforms. The realm was divided into twenty satrapies. Under each satrap were sub-officials, of both native and foreign extraction, who retained the old title of פחה. (Herod. iii. 89, *ἀρχὰς κατεστήσατο . . .*) The military commander in each satrapy corresponded roughly to the *dux* of the later Roman empire and held his command quite independently of the civil administrator. The empire was thus converted from a congeries of semi-independent tributary states under native governments to an international commonwealth administered by Persian officials controlled from Persian headquarters. It is of such an empire that the Elephantiné papyri give us glimpses.

Judea formed part of the province *beyond the river* and this was in fact its technical name in the *lingua franca* (Aramaic) of the Western part of the Persian dominions.[1] The first satrap of this province, תַּתְּנַי (probably *Vištanna* = *Σισσίνης*) by name, began his administration with a tour of the area. Arrived at Jerusalem, he immediately enquired as to the meaning of the building then proceeding, and asked what authority the Jews had for their action. They referred him to the original edict of Cyrus, and this was

[1] עֲבַר נַהֲרָא, Ezra v. 6; vi. 6. Cf. 1 Macc. vii. 8; xi. 60, 62, *ἐν τῷ πέραν τοῦ ποταμοῦ.*

found, on reference to the capital, to support their claim. Darius therefore permitted the completion of the temple. But the satrap was suspicious—with some reason—of the rôle played by Zerubbabel, and as this prince disappears from history about the same time, it would seem that the hereditary system was then done away with, the Jews were no longer allowed a ruler of their own race, and a foreign governor was appointed. Under such a governor Judea would be administered as an ordinary sub-province and Messianic hopes would again be rudely dashed to the ground.

That such a change in administration as we have outlined really did take place seems clear from all the available evidence. Whilst the lists of conquered countries on the Behistun and Persepolis inscriptions are merely traditional geographical or ethnographic terms—eine Menge unterworfener Völker—the *σατραπεῖα* of Herodotus is evidently equivalent to *νομός*. It is thus an administrative term, making a difference as significant as the Revolutionary change in France from the semi-independent *provinces* of the *ancien régime* to the *départements* of the nineteenth century.

The dreams of the Second Isaiah had proved illusory. Like Dante when he wrote his *De Monarchia* in expectation of the restoration of order and of peace by the Emperor Henry VII. of Luxemburg, the Second Isaiah had looked to the advent of Cyrus, had hailed him as the unconscious initiator of the Messianic régime. But within twenty years the satrapy system of Darius had removed the last difference between the administration of Judea and that of its neighbour provinces.

It was indeed but a tiny area and a precarious foothold which the returned exiles had secured. Yet only the power of the Persians made it possible for them to retain this much.

On the north the Phœnicians held "Dor and Joppa in the field of Sharon" by 400.[1] On the south and south-east were the Arabs, who threatened the Ammonites and Moabites in Ezekiel's time,[2] and before Herodotus' time were on the Mediterranean coast by Gaza, where they supported Cambyses during his march through to Egypt. For the Persians had already advanced their power into Egypt and to the Ionian coast before the time of Darius. Hence the necessity of conciliating the Hebrews and the Phœnicians. The existence of Jewish military colonies in Egypt dates back to the time of Cambyses and apparently even earlier, and it would seem that to some extent the peculiar tenets of the Jewish religion were deliberately encouraged both at Jerusalem, and at Yeb and Syene far up the Nile, in order that the Egyptians might be checked on both their frontiers by a race attached to the Persians by special privileges and differentiated by their religion from the surrounding populations.[3]

This was the policy of Darius and Artaxerxes I. in so far as they concerned themselves with the Judean community. They could not, however, secure that community from the pressure of Edomites on the south and east and of the Samaritans on the north, each of these themselves suffering from their own respective neighbours, the Arabs and the Phœnicians.[4] In fact, the Judeans of Haggai's time were glad to reinforce their numbers by admitting to practically full Judean status the Kalibbite clans who held Hebron and even Bethlehem, as well as the kindred tribes of קֵינִ and קְנַז. Thus reinforced the north border-line between Samaritans and Jews ran between Mizpah and

[1] Eshmunazar of Sidon received this from the Persians. *C.I.S.* I. 18–20.

[2] Ezek. xxv. 4 f., 10.

[3] ומן יומי מלך מצרין אבהין בנו אנורא זך ביב בירתא וכזי כנבוזי על מצרין Sach. pl. i. 1, 2. Ungnad 1. אנורא זך בנה השכח

[4] Ezek. xxxv. 5, 10, 12, 14; xxxvi. 2, 5, 6; Lam. iv. 21 f.; Ps. cxxxvii. 7.

Gibeon, the south border-line between Bet-sur and Hebron.[1]

The question of the Kalibbites is interesting as demonstrating the external weakness of the Jewish community and their desperate need of allies. It is thus summed up by Meyer:

"Die Kalibbiten waren viel zu schwach, als dass sie hätten daran denken können, sich feindlich zu verhalten; ihr Interesse wies sie auf engem Anschluss an die neue Gemeinde hin. Dass sie ihn gesucht und gefunden haben, beweist die Stellung, welche ihnen die Chronik zuweist. Damals waren die K. in nationaler und religiöser Beziehung noch גרים Metoeken, *aber privatrechtlich und daher auch politisch den Juden gleichgestellt*, entsprechend der Forderung Ezeckiels."

The whole situation of the Jewish community at the time of Zerubbabel—and we have tried to show that after the brief and soon quenched hopes raised by Haggai and Zechariah it became even worse—is thus described by Meyer:

"For 18 years the Jews who had returned had had enough to do in rebuilding their own houses and in maintaining a bare existence in the face of scanty harvests, droughts, hail and crop-failures, and all this beside the continual quarrels with, and opposition of, their neighbours. The hoped-for and blessed time of the kingdom of God, which the return was to have ushered in, gave no sign of appearing. All the toils and anxieties which necessarily attend the establishment of a new colony, even in a richer land and under more favourable conditions, were of course present. Not one of the glorious hopes with which they had set out had been fulfilled. They had not been able to set themselves to the rebuilding of the temple, even in the early days, when the happy feeling of confidence had not yet weakened, although Cyrus had given instructions

[1] Neh. iii. 9, רפיה בן חור. Cf. Num. xiii. 6; 1 Chr. ii. 18–20; Gen. xxxv. 19, xlviii. 7. Cf. Ezek. xlvii. 22, 23 on "metics."

for this, and Sin-bal-uṣur had taken the first steps towards its accomplishment. It was clear to all that their forces were insufficient, people were glad enough if they could find means to meet the taxes assessed by the Persian government as these fell due, and could maintain in a manner not too entirely unworthy the status and surroundings of their hereditary prince and administrative head."

The only reliable list of the returned community is that of the wall-builders preserved eighty years later by Nehemiah. It is painfully scanty compared to the destinies imagined by the Second Isaiah.

We have: two *κωμάρχοι* of Jerusalem, one of Bet-sur, two of Keila, one of Mizpah, one of Bet-karim (cf. Jer. vi. 1) and also men from Jericho, Zanoach and Tekoa' (cf. Neh. ix.).

If the Jews formed such a small group in 444, they were probably not much more numerous in 520. Zechariah looks forward to a time when fresh immigrants shall come in large numbers from both east and west (Zech. viii. 7) הנה מושיע את עמי מארץ מזרח ומארץ מבוא השמש, when Jerusalem shall be settled and at peace and her subordinate cities shall extend into the Negeb and the Shephelah. Peace and prosperity will then ensure a well-populated capital with old men and old women prolonging their lives into a green old age, and with streets filled with shouting, laughing children. By contrast with this ideal picture how grey is the actual state of affairs. The temple had not been built for lack of funds and of political security. (Zech. viii. 10). There had been no money for the hire of man or beast, nor any possibility of coming and going unmolested, for no one had been secure against attack from his own neighbours. Haggai tells us something of what the colonists, accustomed to the steady heat and the

irrigated plains of Babylonia, had endured from the uncertain conditions on the limestone hills of Judea. Their crops had been ruined by the blasting sirocco from the deserts to the east and south—the *sharqiyeh* of the modern peasant, by green blight, and by sudden hail-storms. Zechariah looks forward to a good period of regular rainfall and bountiful crops when the culture of the vine and the fig shall be permanently and generally re-established.

"Ye shall call every man his neighbour under the vine and under the fig tree. . . . For the seed shall be prosperous, the vine shall give her fruit, and the ground shall give her increase, and the heavens shall give their dew."

Such, I imagine, were the conditions which faced our poet after his arduous journey from the comfort of his natal country. He came not only with high expectations and little knowledge of what his new home was actually like. He and his friends had also brought a large number of animals with them, over 6,000 donkeys, it would seem, and several hundred camels, horses and mules:

"Their horses were 736, their mules 245, their camels 435, their asses 6,720" (Ezra ii. 66, 67).

Probably he also acquired sheep and horned cattle after reaching Judea, for there are several references to these in the poem. But I cannot help thinking that it is not altogether fanciful to suppose a connexion between the beasts of burden in the great caravan and the flocks and herds attributed by the poet to the hero of his story.

J. P. Naish.

(To be continued.)

LITERARY ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

i. 10. *That there be no divisions among you.*

"This heroic spirit of daring and endurance, in which all public and private differences were sunk throughout the whole fleet, is Lord Nelson's great legacy, triply sealed by the victorious impress of the Nile, Copenhagen, and Trafalgar."—Joseph Conrad, *The Mirror of the Sea* (xlvii.).

i. 12. *Every one of you saith, I am of Paul; and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas.*

> "I—'Next Poet?' no, my hearties,
> I nor am nor fain would be!
> Choose your chiefs and pick your parties,
> Not one soul revolt to me!"
>
> Browning, *At the Mermaid.*

i. 17. *Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the gospel.*

Describing the missionary efforts of the French and the English in North America, Francis Parkman in his *History of the Conspiracy of Pontiac* (ch. iii.) observes that "the French had every advantage over rivals whose zeal for conversion was neither kindled by fanaticism nor fostered by an ambitious Government. Eliot laboured within call of Boston, while the heroic Brebeuf faced the ghastly perils of the western wilderness; and the wanderings of Brainerd sink into insignificance compared with those of the devoted Rasles. Yet, in judging the relative merits of the Romish and Protestant missionaries, it must not be forgotten that while the former contented themselves with sprinkling a few drops of water on the forehead of the war-like proselyte, the latter sought to wean him from his barbarism, and penetrate his savage heart with the truths of Christianity."

i. 21. *The world by wisdom knew not God.*

Compare Lacordaire's remark about "la doctrine catholique":—"si elle était une philosophie, elle ne serait pas une religion."

"The God of Plato himself or of Aristotle has little to do with the deities of popular Hellenic tradition. He is the supreme Being who is all that mind or intelligence, which is the highest

sort of being there is, can be. But for that very reason it is true emphatically of Aristotle, though not perhaps without some qualification of Plato, that all vestiges of that personal relation of the worshipper to his God which in its earlier form is connected with the tribesman's claim of blood-relationship on his tribal deity have fallen away from his theology. Hence it was that in the view of the Jew, St. Paul, 'the world by wisdom knew not God.' The philosophical theology was too far removed from the definitely religious needs of the unphilosophical."—C. C. J. Webb, *Problems in the Relations of God and Man*, pp. 210, 211.

Dean Hole, of Rochester, once told of a discussion between Thackeray and a Cambridge professor. "The professor seemed to think that there would be hardly any limit to these attainments [of science and civilisation]. Thackeray spoke as Newton spoke about gathering pebbles on the shore, and affirmed that one of the best results of knowledge was to convince man of his ignorance. He seemed to preach from the text, though he did not quote it, that the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God. It was a combat between pride and humility, and pride had its usual fall."

i. 26. *Not many wise men after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called.*

"Evangelism, in its origin," Mark Pattison writes (in the essay on *Learning in the Church of England*), "was a reaction against the High Church 'evidences'; the insurrection of the heart and conscience of man against an arid orthodoxy. It insisted on a 'vital Christianity,' as against the Christianity of books. Its instinct was from the first against intelligence. No text found more favour with it than 'Not many wise, not many learned.'"

> "Not many wise, rich, noble, or profound,
> In science, win one inch of heavenly ground."
>
> Cowper.

In his journal for November 17, 1759, Wesley writes: "I spent one hour agreeably and profitably with Lady G— H—, and Sir C— H—. It is well a few of the rich and noble are called. O that God would increase their number!"

i. 27. *But God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise; and God hath chosen the weak things of the world to confound the things that are mighty.*

Aristotle, says T. H. Green (*Prolegomena to Ethics*, book iii., ch. 5, 258), knew self-devotion "in no higher form than as it appeared in the citizen-soldier, who faced death calmly in battle for his State. In that further realisation of the soul's capacities which has taken place in the history of Christendom, it has appeared in a far greater wealth of forms. In Aristotle's view the *βίος πρακτικὸς*—the life of rational self-determined activity —was only possible for a few among the few. It presupposed active participation in a civil community. Such communities could only exist in certain select nations, and, where they existed, only a few of the people contributing to their maintenance and living under their direction, were fit to share in civil functions. These alone had moral claims or capabilities. The rest were instruments of their convenience. In modern Christendom it is not merely our theories of life but the facts of life that have changed. 'Weak things of the world and things that are despised hath God called.' With the recognition of rights in human beings as such, there comes a new realisation of human capacities."

ii. 2. *I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified.*

Miss Julia Wedgwood notes in her journal (1865) a saying of Erskine of Linlathen: "There was a time when the watch-word of a party was so closely linked with the reality that people did not see the difference. I do not think it is so now; Paul preached *Jesus*. That word was enough then. Now it may mean anything."

William Lloyd Garrison, the abolitionist writer, once declared: "I am determined to know nothing as a public man save Jesus Christ and Him crucified, and in this country I see Him crucified again in the person of the slave."

"All other religions under the sun make man seek God; this Gospel I preach whets their curiosity, because God is seen seeking man. Beyond all doubt there is such a thing as the scientific study of comparative religions, but Christianity is not one of

them. There is only one Gospel: there are many religions."—D. Crawford, *Thinking Black* (p. 342).

ii. 4. *My speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power.*

South quotes this in one of his sermons (April 30, 1668), when he insists on plain English in preaching. "The eternal salvation and damnation of souls are not things to be treated of with jests and witticisms. And he who thinks to furnish himself out of plays and romances with language for the pulpit, shews himself much fitter to act a part in the revels than for a cure of souls. 'I speak the words of soberness,' said Saint Paul, and I preach the gospel not with the 'enticing words of man's wisdom.' This was the way of the apostles' discoursing of things sacred. Nothing here 'of the fringes of the north star'; nothing of 'nature's becoming unnatural'; nothing of the 'down of angels' wings,' or 'the beautiful locks of cherubims'; no starched similitudes introduced with a 'Thus have I seen a cloud rolling in its airy mansion,' and the like. No, these were sublimities above the rise of the apostolic spirit. For the apostles, poor mortals, were content to take lower steps, and to tell the world in plain terms, 'that he who believed should be saved, and that he who believed not should be damned.' And this was the dialect which pierced the conscience, and made the hearers cry out, 'Men and brethren, what shall we do?' It tickled not the ear, but sunk into the heart. . . In a word, the apostles' preaching was therefore mighty and successful because plain, natural, and familiar, and by no means above the capacity of their hearers."

ii. 7. *We speak the wisdom of God in a mystery.*

"St. Paul uses the word 'mystery' in very much the same sense which St. Chrysostom gives to it in the following careful definition: 'A mystery is that which is everywhere proclaimed, but which is not understood by those who have not right judgment. It is revealed, not by cleverness, but by the Holy Ghost, as we are able to receive it.' In St. Paul the word is nearly always found in connexion with words denoting revelation or publication."—Dean Inge, *Christian Mysticism* (p. 61).

ii. 9, 10. *Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him: but God hath revealed them unto us by His Spirit.*

"'The things which God *hath prepared* for them that love Him.' Hereafter, and up there, above the clouds, you have been taught to think; until you were informed by your land-surveyors that there was neither up nor down, and by aspiring aeronauts that there was nothing in the blue but damp and azote. And now you don't believe these things are prepared *any*where? They are prepared just as much as ever, when and where they used to be: just now, and here, close at hand."—Ruskin, *Fors Clavigera* (lxxii.).

"We often say that we can know at present nothing about heaven; and are accustomed to quote in support of this a text which proves, when taken in connexion with what goes before and follows it, that we know or may know a great deal. I refer to 1 Corinthians ii. 9, 10. 'Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love Him. *But God hath revealed them unto us by His Spirit*; for the Spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God.' These words, and those which follow in the twelfth verse, '*Now we have received* of the Spirit which is of God, to know the things which have been freely given us of Him,' and, indeed, the whole tenor of the chapter, make it evident that the Apostle is not looking beyond the time that now is. . . . It is the heaven within us, and not the heaven above us, that the Apostle would here unfold to us."—Dora Greenwell, *The Covenant of Life*, pp. 100–101.

ii. 11. *For what man knoweth the things of a man save the spirit of man which is in him? even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God.*

"What then have I to do with men, that they should listen to my confessions, as if they were going to heal all my diseases? They are a generation curious and enquiring about the life of others, but slow to amend their own. Why do they desire to hear from me what I am, when they are unwilling to hear from Thee what they themselves are? And when they listen to me

speaking of myself, how do they know if I am telling the truth, since no man knows what is in man, 'except the spirit of man which is in him'? Whereas if they listen to what Thou hast to say about themselves, they will not be able to say, 'The Lord lies,' for what is hearing Thee speak of themselves but learning to know themselves?"—Augustine's *Confessions* (x. 3).

ii. 12. *Now we have received, not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God, that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God.*

"If acquiescence without insight, if warmth without light, if the habit of taking for granted the words of a catechism, remembered or forgotten . . . if these suffice to make men Christians, in what sense could the apostle affirm that believers receive, not indeed worldly wisdom that comes to nought, but the wisdom of God, that we might know and comprehend the things that are freely given to us of God?"—Coleridge, *Aids to Reflection.*

ii. 13. *Which things also we speak, not in the words which man's wisdom teacheth, but which the Holy Ghost teacheth.*

> "To be the very breath that moves the age
> Means not to have breath drive you bubble-like
> Before it—but yourself to blow."
> Browning, *Red Cotton Night-Cap Country.*

iii. 1–2. *And I, brethren, could not speak unto you as unto spiritual, but as unto carnal, even as unto babes in Christ. I have fed you with milk, and not with meat: for hitherto ye were not able to bear it, neither yet now are ye able.*

"After his new birth, he had continued about a fortnight in heaviness, because of manifold temptations—in peace but not in joy. A letter which he received perplexed him, because it maintained that 'no doubting could consist with the least degree of true faith; that whoever at any time felt doubt or fear, was not weak in faith, but had no faith at all; and that none had any faith till the law of the Spirit of life had made him wholly free from the law of sin and death.' Begging God to direct him, he opened his Testament, and his eye fell on that passage where St. Paul speaks of babes in Christ, who were not able to bear strong meat, yet he says to them, 'Ye are God's

building, ye are the temple of God.' Surely then, he reasoned, these men had some degree of faith, though it is plain their faith was but weak."—Southey's *Life of Wesley* (ch. iv.).

iii. 3. *There is among you envying and strife and divisions.*

"Why has re-action triumphed?" Mazzini wrote, in 1835. "The reason lies in ourselves; in our want of organisation, in the dismemberment occasioned in our ranks by systems, some absurd and dangerous, all imperfect and immature, and yet defended in a spirit of fierce and exclusive intolerance; in our ceaseless distrust, in our miserable little vanities, in our absolute want of that spirit of discipline and order which alone can achieve great results; in the scattering and dispersing of our forces in a multitude of small centres and sects, powerful to dissolve, impotent to found."

"We have just religion enough to make us hate," said Swift, "but not enough to make us love one another."

"However little we may admire a State establishment of religion, it is certain that where such an establishment happens to exist, those who have been brought up in it, and have tranquilly conformed to its usages, escape one source of a certain mental asperity and the spirit of division. This is no credit to them or to the institution; any more than the asperity is a discredit to those who do not conform to the institution. Nay, one strong reason why some disapprove of systems of ecclesiastical privilege, is exactly that in modern societies it necessarily engenders this spirit of division. But in itself the spirit of division is no element of strength, but rather of weakness, for one whose task is to touch doubtful or unwilling hearers."—Morley's *Life of Cobden* (ch. ix.).

In a letter of 1810 to the Master of Sidney, who had attacked his views on holiness, Charles Simeon writes: "Persons who have the same general design, but differ in some particular modes of carrying it into execution, often stand more aloof from each other than they do from persons whose principles and conduct they entirely disapprove. The number of those who are zealous in the cause of religion is not so great but that they may find ample scope for their exertions without wasting their time in mutual contentions."

iii. 4–5. *While one saith, I am of Paul; and another, I am of*

Apollos ; are ye not carnal? Who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but ministers by whom ye believed, even as the Lord gave to every man?

"There were few warnings to his pupils," says Stanley in his life of Dr. Arnold (ch. iv.), "on the entrance into life more solemn than those against party spirit, against giving to any human party, sect, society, or cause, that undivided sympathy and service which he held to be due only to the one party and cause of all good men under their Divine Head. There were few more fervent aspirations for his children than that with which he closes a letter in 1833 : 'May God grant to my sons, if they live to manhood, an unshaken love of truth, and a firm resolution to follow it for themselves, with an intense abhorrence of all party ties, save that one tie which binds them to the party of Christ against wickedness.'"

In a letter of 1823, upon Erskine of Linlathen's work, Vinet observes : "Si je ne haissais par principe ces expressions, 'Je suis d'Apollos, et de Céphas,' je me laisserais aller volontiers à dire : Je suis d'Erskine."

iii. 6. *I have planted, Apollos watered.*

In his sketch of an old Scottish gardener, R. L. Stevenson observes : "If you remarked how well a plant was looking, he would gravely touch his hat and thank you with solemn unction ; all credit in the matter falling to him. If, on the other hand, you called his attention to some back-going vegetable, he would quote Scripture : *Paul may plant and Apollos may water* ; all blame being left to Providence, on the score of deficient rain or untimely frosts."

iii. 9. *We are labourers together with God.*

Martineau notes, as a great asset of Dr. Arnold at Rugby, that "he wholly lost sight of *himself*, and never gave occasion for even the perversest spirit to suspect that his battle with school evils was a contest for personal dignity or power ; in his dominance all wrong, he was himself but serving the *right*."

In a letter to a friend, written from Dalkeith in 1844, Dr. Norman Macleod declares : "We want guides, we want reality, we want souls who will do and act before God ; who would have that disposition in building up the spiritual Church, which the reverential Middle Age masons had when elaborately carving

some graven imagery or quaint device, unseen by man's eye, on the fretted roof of a cathedral—they worked on God's house, and before God!"

iii. 11–12. *For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. Now if any man build upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble . . .*

"The more I think of the matter," Dr. Arnold wrote in 1826, "and the more I read of the Scriptures themselves, and of the history of the Church, the more intense is my wonder at the language of admiration with which some men speak of the Church of England, which certainly retains the foundation as sure as all other Christian societies do, except the Unitarians, but has overlaid it with a very sufficient quantity of hay, and stubble, which I devoutly hope to see burnt one day in the fire."

"There is no alchemy by which we may get golden conduct out of leaden instincts—so Herbert Spencer told us very truly; but if our ideals are of gold, there is an alchemy which will transmute our external activities, so that our contributions to the spiritual temple may be no longer 'wood, hay, and stubble,' to be destroyed in the next conflagration, but precious and durable material."—Dean Inge, *Outspoken Essays* (second series), pp. 182–183.

iii. 15. *If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss: but he himself shall be saved; yet so as by fire.*

This was the text which Dr. Arnold used to apply to Dominic, in connexion with his share in the Albigensian Crusade and the foundation of the Inquisition.

"There are lovers of Shakespeare so jealous of his honour that they are unable to suppose that any grave moral flaw could have impaired the nobility of his life and manhood. Shakspere, as he is discovered in his poems and his plays, appears rather to have been a man who by strenuous effort, and with the aid of the good powers of the world, was saved, so as by fire."—Dowden, *Shakspere: His Mind and Art* (pp. 395–396).

iii. 21.

iii. 21. *All things are yours.*

"No thing I know,
Feel or conceive, but I can make my own

Somehow, by use of hand or head or heart;
This is the glory,—that in all conceived,
Or felt or known, I recognise a mind
Not mine but like mine,—for the double joy—
Making all things for me and me for Him."
Browning, *Prince Hohenstiel-Schwangau.*

"Who," says Mr. R. H. Hutton, quoting from verses 5–23 of this chapter, "who that has studied St. Paul at all has not noticed that bold, soaring, dialectic, with which he rises from the forms of our finite and earthly thought to the infinite and the spiritual life embodied in them? . . . What ease and swiftness and power of wing in this indignant upward flight from the petty conflicts of the Corinthian Church; an upward flight which does not cease till the poor subjects of contention, though he himself was one of them, seem lost like grains of sand beneath the bending sky!"

iv. 1, 2. *Let a man so account of us, as of ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God. Moreover it is required in stewards, that a man be found faithful.*

Mr. F. S. Oliver, in his biography of Alexander Hamilton, the American statesman of the eighteenth century, notes that "Hamilton's idea of statesmanship was the faithful stewardship of the estate. His duty was to guard the estate, and, at the same time, to develop its resources. The emotional spring or motive of his endeavours was not a passionate love or pity for his fellow-creatures, but an overwhelming sense of duty towards his Creator, whose providence had appointed him to the stewardship."

iv. 2. *It is required in stewards, that a man be found faithful.*

In *The Secret Agent* (ch. vi.) Conrad describes a native chief in one of the British colonies "whom it was a tradition for the successive colonial governors to trust and make much of as a firm friend and supporter of the order and legality established by white men; whereas, when examined sceptically, he was found out to be principally his own good friend, and nobody else's. Not precisely a traitor, but still a man of many dangerous reservations in his fidelity, caused by a due regard for his own advantage, safety, and comfort."

iv. 3, 4. *With me it is a very small thing that I should be judged of you, or of man's judgment . . . He that judgeth me is the Lord.*

"When you play," said Schumann once to musicians, "do not trouble who is listening to you. Yet always play as if a master were listening."

iv. 5. *Judge nothing before the time.*

"While we are coldly discussing a man's career, sneering at his mistakes, blaming his rashness, and labelling his opinions—'Evangelical and narrow,' or 'Latitudinarian and Pantheistic,' or 'Anglican and supercilious'—that man, in his solitude, is perhaps shedding hot tears because his sacrifice is a hard one, because strength and patience are failing him to speak the difficult word, and do the difficult deed."—George Eliot in *Scenes of Clerical Life.*

iv. 8. *Now ye are rich.*

E. Fitzgerald writes thus of the Rev. T. R. Matthews, a powerful evangelist: "Oh this wonderful, wonderful world, and we who stand in it are in a maze, except poor Matthews of Bedford, who fixes his eyes on a wooden cross and has no misgiving whatsoever. When I was at his chapel on Good Friday, he called at the end of his grand sermon on some of the people to say merely this, that they believed Christ had redeemed them; and first one got up and in sobs declared that she believed it; and then another, and then another—I was quite overset—poor people: how much richer than all who fill the London Churches!"

iv. 9. *We are made a spectacle unto the world.*

"How much the world owes to great sorrows!"

Sir John Seeley.

iv. 10. *We are fools for Christ's sake.*

Thomas Boston put these words on the title-page of his *Fourfold State*; but his friend, Mr. Wightman, who was allowed to prepare it for the press, "without any ceremony," says Boston, deleted them. "And I being urged to set my name to the book, which really from the beginning I designed not to do, could not then do it for a new reason, namely, that they had so mangled it: and from my own conviction I dropped that Scripture, forasmuch as I saw I had declined to be a fool for Christ's sake,

in that point; and therefore the Lord had made me a greater fool than I needed to have been."

iv. 13. *Being defamed.*

"Who—save a few learned people—knows that the Bible records among other things the history of one of the most ambitious and obtrusive souls, of a mind both superstitious and cunning—the history of St. Paul the Apostle?"—Nietzsche, *The Dawn of Day* (§ 68).

iv. 14. *I write not these things to shame you, but to admonish you as my beloved sons.*

Speaking of Pope Innocent III, Paul Sabatier remarks, in his *Life of St. Francis* (ch. vi.) that "when he suppressed ecclesiastical disorders it was less for love of good than for hatred of evil; it was the judge who condemns or threatens, himself always supported by the law, not the father who weeps over his son's offences."

iv. 17. *Timotheus shall bring you into remembrance of my ways which be in Christ, as I teach everywhere in every church.*

"In the business of life I have used prudence and reflection. I have done everything by rules and methods. I have been glad to converse with men of experience and judgment, to find out the reasons why some fail and others succeed in any business. I have taken no step in trade but with great care and caution, considering every advantage or danger that attended it. I have always had my eye upon the main end of business, and have studied all the ways and means of being a gainer by all that I undertook. But what is the reason that I have brought none of these tempers to religion? What is the reason that I, who have so often talked of the necessity of rules and methods and diligence in worldly business, have all this while never once thought of any rules or methods or managements to carry me on in a life of piety?"—William Law, *Serious Call.*

"It is not sufficiently considered," says Johnson in *The Rambler*, "that men more frequently require to be reminded than informed."

NOTES AND NOTICES OF RECENT CRITICISM.

PROPHECY AND SACRIFICE: A NOTE.

It is generally held, with varying reservations, that Deuteronomy is the record of a great contemporary movement of thought of the age in which Jeremiah lived, the basis being the "legislative kernel" (chaps. xii.-xxvi.), and that there was a temporary co-operation until the prophet realised he was of a different spirit from them. There was then a complete breach; he did not, however, reject the authority of the law itself but he swept aside as irreligious what it gave rise to. "To Jeremiah religion was reality . . . to the men who had taken control of the Deuteronomic movement . . . religion was a form."[1]

On the other hand, Professor Kennett [2] argues that while Josiah's reformation obviously marches in matter in many respects with Deuteronomy, it conflicts with it so repeatedly and on such capital counts that the promulgation of Deuteronomy cannot be coupled in this way with the reformation. Deuteronomy is later. Exilic in origin, it bears marks of Jeremiah's teaching. Since it must have been compiled before the breach between Samaria and Judah, the date is placed about 520 B.C. Jeremiah, regarded as an outcast from orthodox religion, rejecting utterly the whole system that Deuteronomy, by a later compromise, attempts to save, has no place, first and last, in his religion for sacrifices at all. He looks forward to a religion wholly free of these.

In support it is effectively pointed out that with an amazingly free handling of the sacred history Jeremiah bluntly denies that God ever meant this or any other sacrifice to be part of His worship (Jeremiah vii. 21 ff.). The spirit of God was not in the thing. It is not simply that sacrificial worship is abused. Abused or not it is unnecessary, and cannot be of Divine origin. Jeremiah therefore rejects the inspiration of any other teaching. If sacrificial rites were to be regarded as essential they must be swept

[1] Cf. Dr. Skinner's *Prophecy and Religion* (Camb. Univ. Press, 1922), pp. 91 f., 103 f., 175 f.

[2] *Cambridge Biblical Essays: Deuteronomy and the Decalogue* (Camb. Univ. Press, 1920); *Journal of Theological Studies*, vol. vii, 1906; *Date of Deuteronomy*, vol. xv., p. 604 ff.

away with a vigorous hand. Amos goes even further, if that were possible, in his passionate repudiation (v. 21–25) and absolutely denies that there were any sacrifices in the wilderness at all—if the rhetorical question means anything. Apart from condemnation of the abuse of sacrifice Jeremiah (vii. 21 f.), Hosea (vi. 6), Micah (vi. 6), and Amos (v. 21 f.) condemn it as useless and uncalled for. Jeremiah declares that at the Exodus God gave no instruction regarding sacrifice, while Amos puts a rhetorical question demanding a negative reply when he asks if they brought God sacrifices in the wilderness. All this is higher criticism with a vengeance—not so much on the part of the critics, where it is really a choice of evidence, but on the part of the prophets who thus sweep aside priestly explanations now embedded in our Old Testament. Basing their argument on these prophetic utterances, some scholars hold that the prophetic religion thus sharply in contradiction with the priestly religion is not essentially new in its relation to sacrifice, but is in lineal descent from the religion of Moses (or the age he represents) whose genius it was to be the revealer of a religion not only monotheistic but non-sacrificial. There were no sacrifices in the wilderness. The absorption of the Canaanite sacrifices was a step backwards into the welter of pagan practices. Accordingly, Passover, for example, which bears the marks of a primitive sacrifice, was a heathen rite until then and, taken over into Israel, was named and fitted into such a place in the tribal traditions of Israel as would justify its inclusion in the Israelitish sacrifices. References to the altars of Moses must be regarded as erroneous ; only that document which makes no such reference is to be regarded as reliable.

The adoption of this view creates a gap in the Exodus period. Sacrifice is in abeyance in Israel for a time, and the universal primitive customs pass from the pre-Exodus days to Canaan, as far as Israel is concerned, before they are knitted together again.

There are, however, grave difficulties in the way of acceptance of this theory. Some of these may be stated.

1. Moses is most closely associated with, and his name is repeatedly used to lend authority to, the sacrifices. It seems strange that this should be done, if he was historically to be associated with the very reverse, with a movement of stupendous originality and daring in the opposite direction. The abuse of

his name in this connexion seems so insolent a piece of bluff that it is hard to believe that even an unscrupulous and astute priesthood would successfully carry it through.

2. Have we any solid ground for crediting Jeremiah and Amos with a knowledge of the Exodus period withheld from others ? Emphatic as are the passages referred to, it seems strange that if these declarations were based on historical information they did not make more of the facts. Had they been really able to use the Mosaic authority with knowledge they would surely have done so with overwhelming and final force and not in simply a few passages. That the strictly relevant passages *are* few is clear from the fact that they are constantly appealed to. It is hard to believe the prophets would be so inept in propaganda.

3. And it is almost unbelievable—it requires a very high degree of partisan credulity to believe—that a religious revolution, such as is, on this theory, assumed to have taken place in the wilderness, should leave no record behind it but an isolated sentence and a rhetorical question.

4. The general evidence is all against such a view. It is not impossible : but it requires very clear evidence to prove that Israel thus early practised a religion without sacrifice. One may of course (accepting the narrative here !) argue that monotheism was as great an achievement and that it is to attribute no more to believe that the leader also persuaded the people to accept a non-sacrificial religion. But the argument is not valid. Monotheism is in the direct line of Israel's development. Israel is led from its common early stages, no doubt, to a belief in a limited tribal God, to a tribal God of greater power less localised, to the God of a people, with a purpose for them, to the one true God, to the one God. Moreover, one could remain quietly quite polytheistic without anyone making a fuss about it. But a sacrifice is a sacrifice. You performed it or you did not. Private reservations are of no avail here, lingering superstitions find no comfortable outlet. The people cannot lag easily behind the leaders. It is either done, or it is not done. Not only so, but while there is no great difficulty in accommodating yourself to a teaching that requests you to abolish all gods but your own, for the salient matter is the due acknowledgment of your own and (since "the gods are kittle cattle") in any case you privately pay your duties to all, to give up sacrifice where there is no way of compromise is

to give up, really, what has to the world so far been religion. Is there room in the history for a passage, ten times more striking than any movement towards monotheism, so profoundly radical, abolishing a custom that was religion itself, slicing at the roots of the deepest universal religious instincts? Thought is free, elusive, indeterminate, personal, hidden. The absolute prohibition of religious custom, traditionally and universally regarded as the very essence of religion, is a wholly different thing.

It is perhaps not irrelevant to make the remark that prophecy has its history no less than sacrifice. To compare the crudities of sacrifice with the noble measures of the loftiest prophecy is not fair. As truly might one compare the tender and beautiful emotions of a Christian Communion with the wild animal prophetic ecstasies of the Dionysian revels of which the Bacchae of Euripides tell, and call the former "sacrifice" and the latter "prophecy." Prophecy has its history too, from its barbaric origins and phrenetic ecstasies, but it is not to be judged there. Nor is sacrifice.

INNES LOGAN.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

(*a*) "In some London newspapers I read attacks upon your translation of the Old Testament as being undignified; one writer in particular objects to a Gilbert and Sullivan touch of profanity and ill-placed humour in your rendering of Judges xv. 16, where Samson says, in the Authorised Version, 'With the jawbone of an ass, heaps upon heaps, with the jaw of an ass have I slain a thousand men.' Your version is:

> 'With the jawbone of an ass I have piled them in a mass!
> With the jawbone of an ass I have assailed assailants.'

Some reviewers make fun of this punning couplet. I do not know any Hebrew myself, but I venture to ask what you would say about such criticisms." (A. C. V., Birmingham.)

What Mrs. Squeers said about what Mr. Squeers said, "Stuff!" Opinions of this kind are the result of pure ignorance, wherever you come across them; no one who had an elementary knowledge of what he was criticising would print such ludicrous views. Hebrews were fond of playing on words, in prose and verse, and this couplet of Samson is an instance of it, in rather

a grim style. The actual Hebrew of the first line runs like this :

Bilĕhi ha-hamor
hamor hamartim.

As Sir G. A. Smith puts it, in his Schweich lecture on *The Early Poetry of Israel* (pp. 92 f.), "the savage humour of the verse lies in this, that the Hebrew for 'ass' and for 'heaps'" have the same consonants. The pun is almost untranslatable, but it has to be brought out somehow, though the Authorised Version misses the point entirely. Modern editors and translators render the shout variously, but all with this in view ; e.g. :

"With the jaw of an ass
I smashed them in mass ;
With the jaw of an ass
Slew a thousand of men."

Or—

"With the jawbone of an ass have I piled them mass on mass ;
A thousand warriors have I slain with the jawbone of an ass."

My version is along these lines, which are, of course, the only correct ones.

(*b*) ". . . But may I say that I felt some agreement with the reviewer who took exception to your translation of David's question in 2 Samuel xviii. 32 ? 'Is young Absalom all right ?' Can you justify this version ?" (V. H., London.)

Yes. It so happened that on the very day I was working on this chapter (in 1917), I had occasion to visit a family. When I was in the house, news came that the Germans had sunk one of our hospital-ships. Now a son of the family was a doctor on board, and at once the mother cried out, "Is Jack all right ?" She didn't say, "Is Jack safe ?" In such moments of tension there is a psychological tendency to keep the actual danger out of one's words ; you use deliberately language which is lesser than the truth at the back of your mind. When I heard her words, I at once thought that this was precisely the translation for the phrase on which I had been puzzling in the forenoon.

May I add that here and elsewhere in the translation what may seem to be strange or casual is based upon serious considerations of idiomatic English ; I never wrote any sentence,

I think, without a careful thought of what the original would denote in the corresponding dialect of the present day.

(*c*) " As a fellow-minister, may I ask your help ? I have long wished to preach upon Saint Paul's words, in Colossians iii. 14 : ' above all these things put on charity, which is the bond of perfectness.' Yet I am not clear what they mean. Can you explain the phrase, please ? " (J. C. A., Liverpool.)

The sense of the passage is something like this. After recalling the Colossian Church to the Christian graces of character, such as humility, patience, mutual forgiveness, and consideration, Paul adds, *ἐπὶ πᾶσιν δὲ τούτοις τὴν ἀγάπην, ὅ ἐστιν σύνδεσμος τῆς τελειότητος* (Col. iii. 14). Why and how, you may ask, is love ' the bond of perfectness ? ' This is the only place where Paul uses *τελειότης*, but the context indicates that it refers neither to the Christian virtues nor to the individual life ; *τελειότης* means the full expression of the divine life (iii. 1–14) in the Christian community, and this is inspired by *ἀγάπη*, as has been already argued (i. 4, *τὴν πίστιν ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ τὴν ἀγάπην ἣν ἔχετε εἰς πάντας τοὺς ἁγίους*). Love is the link of the perfect life, for it holds Christians together in fellowship ; it checks the selfish, harsh tempers which keep people apart. The idea is not that love unites all the other graces and so completes them or enables Christians to be *τελείοι*. These graces are expressions of love, and Paul is simply summing up their common spirit, the pre-eminent and fundamental power in church-life, which as *ἠγαπημένοι* (verse 12) by God Christians must display to one another. *Ἐπὶ πᾶσιν δὲ τούτοις* (= *ἐπὶ πάντων δὲ τούτων*, above all) *τὴν ἀγάπην* (sc. *ἐνδύσασθε* from verse 12 : you must be loving), *ὅ ἐστιν σύνδεσμος* (= vinculum here, not fasciculus) *τῆς τελειότητος* (for love is the link of the perfect life), i.e. *τῆς τελειότητος* is not a genitive of quality (= love is a perfect link between human beings), though this yields a good sense, but follows *σύνδεσμος* almost as a subjective genitive. The ' perfect life ' of the Church is one free from (iii. 1–13) vice and immorality, bitter words and sins of the tongue, dishonesty and untruthfulness, prejudices of nationality and class, the selfish and unforgiving spirit. This is the life of the Body (verse 15), whose Head is Christ. Matthew Arnold thought that all this stress upon the kind, forbearing, unselfish spirit, was a proof of Paul's indebt-

edness to the influence of Jesus, even before he had been converted; that these characteristic ideas of Jesus "sank down and worked" in the spirit of Paul, even before he ceased to persecute, "and had no small part in getting him ready for the crisis of his conversion." Certainly, it is remarkable that the sequence of thought in Colossians iii. 13–14 corresponds to that in Matthew v. 43–48. The apostle argues: "As Christ forgave you, so you must forgive. And above all you must be loving, for love is the link of the perfect life." Jesus similarly had summed up His teaching on the duty of mutual forgiveness by declaring, "you must be perfect as your heavenly Father is perfect." For individuals in a Christian community to lead the "perfect" or full life of that community, love is essential. It alone holds the strong and the weak together, in the strain of intercourse and fellowship. For those who make moral advances themselves are tempted to be censorious, where they see the imperfect lives of their fellows; the good are disposed to be hard and harsh in judging the defects of erring fellow-members; and, especially when an injury is inflicted by one Christian on another, the temptation is for the injured person to retaliate or be unforgiving. All these tempers are a breach of the common life, and the one power which inspires Christians to overcome them is that of love.

To make these generalities definite, we may recall two illustrations from later Church life One is Wesley's letter to his brother Charles, written about 1762; "by perfection I mean the humble, gentle, patient love of God and man, ruling all the tempers, words, and actions: the whole heart and the whole life." The other is Pusey's letter to a friend, in 1880: "In our early Tractarian days we used a prayer out of Daniel ix., with other prayers of humiliation and for internal unity. J. H. Newman drew them up at my wish. Now we seem to do nothing but bark at and devour one another."

Perhaps these notes may be of some service to you.

REVIEWS.

Pentateuchal Criticism. By D. C. Simpson, D.D., with an Introduction by the Right Rev. H. E. Ryle, C.V.O., D.D. Oxford University Press. Pp. xvi + 211. 6*s.* 6*d.*

The classical Introduction to the Old Testament is, and probably long will be, that of the late Canon Driver. It has been through a large number of editions, and, as is done with the standard Lexicons and Grammars, it is constantly being brought up to date. It is scientific and detailed, and gives a fair average critical point of view. Of the same type, yet more compressed, was that of the late Dr. Buchanan Gray, and an Introduction showing greater originality and independence is that of Sellin, recently published in English.

In these more comprehensive Introductions, as well as in the fairly numerous popular presentations of critical results, the discussion usually suggests a somewhat chilly scientific treatise. There is, moreover, seldom room for any detailed illustration of the methods of the critic, or statement of the kind of difficulty which has led to his particular type of research. As a rule, too, the treatment of the material leaves no room for more than a faint suggestion of the writer's personal feeling of the value of the Old Testament as a religious literature. The result is that a reader who has little or no previous acquaintance with the subject is apt to form an entirely false impression as to its nature and purpose. Hence arises theological controversy, often carried on with extreme bitterness, and involving misunderstanding and misrepresentation which may almost suggest deliberate falsehood.

The Oxford University Press has done very great service in reprinting Canon Simpson's book. The first edition attracted little attention, probably because it appeared on the eve of the War, certainly not because of any fault or weakness in the book itself. For it is one of the best that have ever been published on the subject, and meets various needs which seem to have been seriously neglected. A good deal of it is devoted to the attacks that have been made on the "Higher Criticism," where those attacks have been arguments and not mere abuse. Thus five very important pages are given to "Archæology and the

Pentateuch," and it is pointed out that the archæologist has sometimes misunderstood—nay, it would seem, even invented—a critical position which he attacks, and at others has stated as a fact a theory which is just as wild as the most extreme views of his "opponents." A valuable contribution is the Appendix on the use of the Divine names in Genesis, in which Canon Simpson makes free use of Skinner's reply to Dahse and adds important material of his own. Throughout he is conscious of a hostile environment, and the reader feels that even where no direct argument is being used the position is being stated with a view to meeting actual or possible criticism. But it is worthy of note that whilst much of the work is thus clearly controversial, the language is always restrained and dignified, and there is no trace of that abuse which too often disfigures theological debate. Canon Simpson is a follower of One who "when He was reviled, reviled not again."

The position adopted is in the main that of Driver, and it is stated with admirable lucidity. Driver and Gray may be difficult for the lay mind to follow, but here we have a statement of their case which should leave no one in any uncertainty. Particularly valuable for this purpose are the occasional quotations from the Pentateuchal narrative itself, as when, on pp. 46 ff., the two stories of the Creation are set side by side, and, on p. 78, a selection from Genesis xxxvii. as analysed into its two component narratives (this, by the way, is an important illustration of the critical method, for the Divine name does not occur at all in the chapter). Very useful, too, are the quotations of actual lists of words and expressions characteristic of certain documents, taken from such writers as Driver and McNeile. It may be added that the discussion of the Elephantiné papyri and their bearing on the critical position is the best that has yet appeared in English.

In a yet more striking feature Canon Simpson's work is an answer to the "critics of criticism." That is the strongly devotional tone which marks the whole of his work. To him the Pentateuch is Divine revelation, and is given that we may read the story of God's dealings with men. It is impossible to question the sincerity or the spirituality of the writer. He is concerned to discover, if he can, the *method* of revelation, but as to its reality he has no doubts. He never falls into the

mistake of supposing that criticism is an end in itself, and the reader should pay special attention to the passage which he quotes on p. 151 from the Dean of Ely as representing his own views. In fact the last chapter on "The Divine Purpose in Hebrew Religion" may be taken as a summary and crown of the whole book.

The highest scholarship without a trace of pedantry, skilful controversy without bitterness, caution without timidity, the whole inspired by a vital faith in the crucified Redeemer—these things make Canon Simpson's book one which it is difficult to overpraise and impossible to recommend too warmly to any one who wishes to know the truth about the Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch.

T. H. Robinson.

DR. MOFFATT'S TRANSLATION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT [1]

Dr. Moffatt is to be congratulated on a truly remarkable achievement. To judge by the first volume of his new translation of the Old Testament, which is the subject of this notice, he has successfully surmounted the formidable obstacles in the path of such an enterprise. The possibilities of failure here were immense; and the measure of the successful achievement is by so much the more enhanced.

I.

Before we come to consider the special features of the new translation, a word must be said as to the need and place for such a version, and what it should be designed to supply. People are so much accustomed to the great prose of the English version of 1611, its magnificence is so marked, and its place as one of the supreme classics of our language is so fully assured, that they are sometimes in danger of forgetting that it is a translation at all—a translation more than 300 years old; and that in the interval enormous advances have been made in the textual, critical, and archæological study of the Old Testament, which have thrown a completely new light upon large parts of its text. An attempt was made to meet these new conditions, to some extent, by the publication of the Revised Version in 1884. But

[1] *The Old Testament:* A New Translation by James Moffatt, Vol. I., *Genesis to Esther* (Hodder and Stoughton).

though great advances were made here, the work as a whole was marred by the application of too rigid rules, with the result that much of its best results is buried in the margins. The need for a new rendering into modern English, which shall reflect the best and most assured results of modern scholarship, is clamant. It has practically been met by the publication of Dr. Moffatt's new version.

Another point that needs to be emphasised is that a good modern English rendering, if used side by side with the A.V., serves the purpose to a large extent of a commentary. The old familiar words, read side by side with the new rendering, become alive with new meaning. Dr. Moffatt has already published his new translation of the New Testament side by side with the Authorised Version; it is to be hoped that at some time in the future it will be found possible to produce a similar edition of the Old Testament. In order to test the quality of Dr. Moffatt's work in the new translation, two questions must be asked: (*a*) Does it adequately reflect the results of modern scholarship? and (*b*) Is it an effective modern English rendering, preserving the note of dignity as well as of modernness?

II.

Dr. Moffatt remarks in his Introduction to the new version: "The primary difficulties are started by the text. The traditional 'Massoretic' text is often desperately corrupt. Sometimes the 'disrepair' can be mended with the aid of the ancient versions; sometimes by conjectural emendation; and sometimes nothing can be done." In cases such as the last Dr. Moffatt leaves a blank indicated by a few dots. Where a gap occurs in the text (some words having fallen out), it is indicated in this way. A case of this sort is Gen. xxxv. 22 (*And when Isaac heard . . .*). Another example of a similar kind (where some words have probably fallen out by accident) is noted in 2 Kings viii. 21: *Whereupon Jehoram went across to Zair with all his chariots . . . However, Jehoram, with his captains of his chariots beside him, rose by night and raided the Edomites who hemmed them in.* In the space indicated by the dots some words have probably fallen out describing how the king fell into an ambush. The clauses that follow the dots will then describe how he cut his way through the surrounding force, and saved part of his army by flight. Dr.

Moffatt has used this method throughout. He has also not hesitated to emend the text in cases where there is good ancient authority, and where there is a large measure of agreement among scholars. Thus, to take an example, in 2 Kings xv. 10 : the English versions (including the R.V.) have *Shallum . . . smote him before the people :* the new translation correctly, *Shallum . . . struck him down dead at Ibleam.* Corrections of this kind are tacitly adopted throughout. No indication is given that the official text is being departed from. No doubt it would have been impracticable to indicate such changes in notes without overburdening the pages. But it does seem desirable that some method should be adopted to warn the reader. Why not marginal notes as in the R.V. ?

Further, the present translation marks an enormous advance by indicating different *strata* in the text of the books. By the use of italic, as well as the ordinary type, and by different combinations of brackets, the parallel narratives in the Hexateuch are pointed out ; and later additions to, or interpolations in, all the Books are made clear. This is done with great skill, and is an enormous boon. It is quite remarkable how much the structure of a book is clarified in rapid reading by this method.[1]

Lastly, Dr. Moffatt has occasionally transposed passages, a plan which he adopted, to some extent, in the New Testament translation. Thus, in 1 Kings chapters xix. + xxi. + xx. appear in this order ; and 2 Kings xviii.–xx. appears as follows :— xviii. 1–12 + xx. 1–19 + xviii. 13–37 + xix. 1–9*a*, 36–37, 9*b*–20, 32–34, 21–31, 35 + xx. 20–21. There are, of course, good reasons for these transpositions, though the details may be arranged somewhat differently by some scholars in some cases. It would be possible to enlarge on these points at greater length, but restrictions of space forbid. Enough, however, has been said to make it abundantly clear that this new version marks a great advance in embodying the results of scholarship as compared with any previous version which can be set beside it.

III.

But what are we to say as to the character of the translation itself ? Does it fulfil its purpose ? This has been clearly

[1] The translator explains in his Preface that he has not attempted to indicate sources except where he found it to be absolutely necessary. The broad distinctions are given.

defined by the Translator in his Preface as "an attempt to present the Books of the Old Testament in effective and intelligible English." "It is a fresh translation of the original, not a revision of any English version." The translator has set himself an extraordinarily difficult task, and has succeeded extraordinarily well. His English rendering is amazingly fresh and modern; and moreover it has caught something of the oriental flavour of the original, without losing its effectiveness as English. And all this has been accomplished—in spite of some few infelicities—without sacrificing dignity. The result is that the old has become new and fresh, and there has resulted a great clarification. Dr. Moffatt is bold and original in his renderings—Noah's Ark is modernised into a "barge," the "city of David" becomes "David's burg," "elders" is transformed into "sheikhs," Saul appears among "the dervishes," a "coverlet" becomes a "bath-towel," and a "mess of pottage" an "omelet." Some renderings are wonderfully happy, as, e.g., "Jacob's ladder," where ladder is changed into "a flight of steps" and "sons of the prophets" becomes "guild of the prophets." The poetical passages are also rendered with great freshness and originality, though the occasional use of rhyme in English is not always effective. A certain balanced rhythm of the lines is probably the best way of rendering the Hebrew poems. A short specimen of Dr. Moffatt's rendering in prose and verse may fittingly conclude this part of our notice, and illustrate what has been said.

The first passage is 2 Kings ix. 18 ff.:

When the sentinel had reported that the messenger had reached them but was not returning, the king sent out a second man who also gave the king's message, "Is all well?" "What have you to do with welfare?" said Jehu: "fall in behind me." The sentinel reported, "He reached them, but he is not returning, and the driving is like the driving of Jehu, the grandson of Nimshi, for he drives like a madman." "Harness my chariot," said Jehoram. They did so, and Jehoram, king of Israel, drove out to meet him with Ahaziah, king of Judah, each in his own chariot. They came upon him in the field of Naboth the Jezreelite. On seeing Jehu, Jehoram said, "Is all well, Jehu?" "Well?" he retorted, "how can it be well so long as your mother Jezebel goes on with all her seductions and wiles?"

The following is from 2 Sam. xxii. 11 ff. :

He rode on flying kherubs,
and swooped with the wings of the wind,
shrouding himself in darkness,
that veiled his presence round,
with rain-clouds dark and dense,
hail and lightning flashing before him,
as the Eternal thundered from heaven,
as the most High uttered His voice ;
he scattered his arrows,
shot twisting flashes of lightning,
till the beds of the sea were seen,
and earth's foundations were laid bare
as the Eternal stormed,
as his nostrils snorted.

One thing the present reviewer deeply regrets—the use of "the Eternal" to represent the divine name *Yahweh*. This is an intensely personal name, which has been disguised by the substitution by the Jews of "The Lord." It is a loss that another substitute—"the Eternal"—has been allowed to usurp the place of the personal name, especially in the most primitive and authropomorphic passages, such as Gen. ii.

* * * * *

Dr. Moffatt has rendered a signal service to the best interests of Bible study by bringing in this vivid and arresting way the results of scholarship to the mass of readers, who simply read and study the Bible without any special helps. He has done more than this ; he has made the Old Testament a new book which will attract many readers who would not otherwise open its pages. A dangerous rift between the higher scholarship of the Old Testament and popular ideas of the Bible was manifesting itself ; Dr. Moffatt has provided a bridge. The present reviewer has suggested more than once that Old Testament scholars should try to throw light on the problems of the New Testament from the point of view of the Old. The process is now reversed, and in the person of one of its most brilliant exponents New Testament scholarship has, as a most welcome and powerful ally, illuminated the Old.

G. H. Box.

CURRENT LITERATURE.

In *The Christian Way of Life* (Lindsey Press : 1*s.* net), Professor W. W. Fenn, of Harvard University, illustrates what he regards as the essential principles of Christian experience from the religious history of New England during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. He shows good judgment in his estimate of Jonathan Edwards. Edwards comes out a far nobler thinker than popular ideas realise. But Professor Fenn admits that comparatively few were influenced by the splendid ideal of the Christian life put forward by Edwards. "The great majority of them," i.e. congregations and ministers, "kept on in the dull plodding way of their mitigated Calvinism, languidly encouraging the commonplace virtues of conventional morality, with no glimpse of any Christian ideal surpassing them." Then came the controversy with the Unitarians, who used to advocate "philanthropy and education instead of evangelisation." And one result of this controversy, in the nineteenth century, was the re-discovery of Jesus. Professor Fenn at the close of a singularly candid essay makes this remark, that "to define a Christian as one who feeds the hungry and clothes the naked or (to speak more after the mode of scientific charity) who works in settlements and clubs, is active in social reforms and the like, is to lose sight of the deepest significance of Jesus Himself, and to miss the very heart of Christianity." This is one of the timely sayings in a decidedly fresh pamphlet.

* * * * *

Reality in Bible Reading. By Frank Ballard, D.D. Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark. 6*s.*

The sub-title of Dr. Ballard's vigorous book is "the gain to Christian faith from critical accuracy in the ordinary public or private reading of the English Bible—with more than four hundred examples." Dr. Ballard's conviction is that not only in private but in public the interests of religious reality demand a more exact rendering of the Scriptures than the Authorised or even the Revised Version of the English Bible allows. He pleads for accuracy, and rejects any "ecclesiastical camouflage"; he desires the elimination or at least the explanation of archaisms when a lesson is read, and asks, "Is it any wonder, or anything

but commendable, that some Christian preachers who care more for truth than tradition or convention, should wish to read their 'lessons' from Dr. Weymouth, or *The Twentieth Century New Testament*, or Dr. Moffatt—so as to give their audiences helpful teaching rather than mental confusion?" The examples are mainly selected from the New Testament, though Dr. Ballard does not ignore the Old; indeed he observes frankly that he doubts "whether the reading of the book known as Ecclesiastes should be included as any portion of a Christian service," and holds that the indiscriminate reading of the minor prophets in public "can only produce confusion and misunderstanding." He is well aware that many good Christians resent being shaken out of the rut, and that it is often an ungrateful task to disturb associations, however erroneous, which have gathered round some biblical phrase or text. But Dr. Ballard is nothing if he is not courageous. Some of his explanations are less convincing than others. Still, the general effect of his book is wholesome and arresting. "One cannot help asking, again and again, why read the Bible at all, either at home or in public? Is it really just for the sake of going over well-known words supposed to be sacred, so that, like attendance at the Romish 'Mass,' the mere going through it—*ex opere operato*—recommends men to God? Or is there any real desire to understand, to feel, to learn, and then to behave accordingly? The reply seems sadly doubtful." It would be less doubtful if Dr. Ballard's trenchant pages were allowed to make a proper impact on the mind.

* * * * *

Eight editions in four years is a fair index of popularity for a book of sermons, and the latest edition of Mr. Hubert L. Simpson's *The Intention of His Soul* (Hodder and Stoughton: 3*s.* 6*d.*) has the further advantage of being cheap. To those who may not yet know the book, it is enough to say that it contains twenty-six religious addresses, suggested by the Bible. They are intensely alive to the needs of modern life, excellently written, and full of distinction.

* * * * *

Professor Burkitt's three lectures on *Christian Beginnings* (University of London Press: 4*s.* 6*d.*) are, as he confesses, "somewhat scattered observations" upon the New Testament, evidently suggested by *The Beginnings of Christianity*, a recent American

production, with which Dr. Burkitt sometimes agrees, and from which he occasionally differs. This small book on a large subject is written with urbanity and detachment. It is easy to read, like all Dr. Burkitt's popular work ; such addresses, as delivered, must have been interesting to hear, and even in print they are attractive, owing to their lightness of touch. But, apart from a note at the end on Mark xiii. 10, they do not go deep enough. Most of the opinions voiced by Dr. Burkitt, e.g. the identification of Galatians ii. 1–10 with Acts xi. 30, or of the resurrection appearance to the five hundred with Pentecost, have been thoroughly discussed already ; his rejection of the Galilean visions of the resurrection, in favour of the Lucan tradition, is unsatisfactory, for surely it was natural for believers, once convinced that Jesus was Messiah, to return to Jerusalem the traditional centre of a messianic movement. In some *obiter dicta* on the Epistles, Professor Burkitt thinks that the Epistle of James is " a free Greek rendering of an original Aramaic discourse made by James, the brother of the Lord, to some Jewish-Christian community," and that the Thessalonian Epistles are only Paul's in name, being really drafted by Silvanus. It is reassuring, however, to hear Dr. Burkitt putting in a word in favour of Luke's honesty and historical conscience ; he even declares that " in the Acts of the Apostles we have not a religious novel but an historical work." In the American production, on which his lectures are now and then a running commentary, the book of Acts is treated as a document where modern historians may grudgingly allow here and there a germ of fact. It would have been very useful if Dr. Burkitt had worked out his " scattered observations," instead of throwing them down, as he too often does ; the student would have preferred to see if he could say anything fresh in their favour, for, apart from a larger argument, they do not make sufficient impression on a trained mind.

* * * * *

We have already (p. 79) called attention to Dr. R. E. Hume's admirable handbook, *The World's Living Religions*. An English edition has now been published by Messrs. T. and T. Clark, price 7*s*. This will bring it within the range of readers in this country, and we hope it will find a large public ; no better manual of its class can be recommended to students.

Dr. R. H. Fisher modestly remarks that his Baird Lecture, *Religious Experience* (Hodder and Stoughton : 10*s.* 6*d.*), " claims no merit except that of contact with human life." But this is surely a real merit. There are eight chapters in his most readable book, and they all deal with subjects of living interest. Is everyone religious ? Are we responsible for our beliefs ? What is conversion ? Why be good ? These are some of the questions asked and answered by Dr. Fisher, in no mere academic spirit ; he is constantly recurring to the issue, how people live, and how ought they to live. There is, for example, a sensible exposition of the cardinal virtues, and the seventh chapter contains a practical estimate of middle age and old age, which is much to the point. What Dr. Fisher has given us is a bright, suggestive survey of the data covered by his title. He has adorned his pages with a number of apt illustrations from literature and history. Two of these, however, we venture to question. When the psalmist wrote, " we spend our years as a tale that is told," he was not suggesting " something of the significance of life and its romance " (p. 299). " Tale " here is not a story but the reckoning of sheep passing hurriedly one after another into the fold ; it is the brevity of life which is the point of the comparison, in the Authorised Version of Psalm xc. 9. And was it *Frederick the Great* which Carlyle had to re-write, because the original manuscript had been destroyed (p. 233) ?

* * * * *

Professor C. H. Turner has issued a second edition of his pamphlet on *The Study of the New Testament* (Oxford : the Clarendon Press, 5*s.* net). It contains a survey delivered in 1920. Professor Turner has left the text unaltered, but, although he has not brought his subject up to date, he has added four or five pages of additional notes, which increase the value of the argument. Two suggestions are made about the New Testament text which are striking. In Mark vii. 28 he proposes to omit *ναί*, with a few Western authorities, and to render, " Sir, even the dogs do get something, they get the crumbs." In Hebrews xiii. 9 he conjectures *δοχαῖς* for *διδαχαῖς*, on the ground that the lavish hospitality of the Jews was a danger to their Christian neighbours. " Invitations from duchesses have been thought to be in our own day the surest means of undermining the party loyalty of democratic politicans ; and the writer of the Epistle

was afraid of what might follow, if the Christians he addressed allowed themselves to be made much of in the houses of their non-Christian acquaintances in Jerusalem." It is difficult for anyone to take this very seriously, who knows the grave and deep argument which really runs through the context of these words in Hebrews.

* * * * *

Professor Turner's new pamphlet, *The Early Printed Editions of the Greek Testament* (Oxford : the Clarendon Press, 1*s.* 6*d.*), is a scholarly, lucid description of how we got the Greek Testament during the first half of the sixteenth century. It contains some excellent bibliographical material about the edition prepared by Erasmus. Or rather, the editions. Thus, as Professor Turner drily observes, when Erasmus promised the critics of his first edition that he would insert 1 John v. 7, provided that it could be discovered in any Greek manuscript, and when it was discovered in one manuscript (then in England), and he kept his promise, " if he had known that the English manuscript was in the strictest sense contemporary, and was probably written in Oxford about 1520, he might have entertained the suspicion that the manuscript was written for the purpose of providing the evidence."

* * * * *

In *Intimate Letters of a Quaker Magistrate* (London : Swarthmore Press, 3*s.* 6*d.*) extracts are printed from the correspondence of Mr. J. J. Cooper, of Reading, who died in 1920. The extracts begin in 1913 ; they contain good-humoured, shrewd observations on men and books and current events, and show at any rate a man who held strong opinions. " I am one of those who consider that the Old and New Testaments ought not to be bound up together." " Mrs. Browning is more poetical than her husband." " Such modern poets as John Masefield I find wearisome." Such are some of his casual deliverances. But Dr. Horton, who contributes a foreword, is right in claiming that " there is a certain freedom of judgment, an independence which comes from thinking instead of listening to what others say, a freshness of view, a charm in the prejudices, and an unfailing friendliness to his correspondent, which produce a very happy atmosphere."

CURRENT ISSUES.

Dr. F. J. Powicke has written *A Life of the Reverend Richard Baxter*. He is a native of Kidderminster, and he dates his interest in Baxter from the day—it was July 25, 1875—when he listened to Dean Stanley's eulogy on Baxter at the unveiling of the statue raised there to his memory. He admires Baxter, naturally, but his biography is not blind to the weak points in his hero's character. Dr. Powicke in particular calls attention to Baxter's failure to appreciate Oliver Cromwell, and the reason he assigns for this defect is interesting. Baxter was above the narrow political and ecclesiastical prejudices which have kept many people from understanding Cromwell's genius, but he did not understand him. And when we ask why, Dr. Powicke replies: "he was not sufficiently mystical."

* * * * *

Now there are times when the weary student is inclined to propose that for a time and times and half a time the word "mystical" should be dropped from the vocabulary of authors. It is used with incredible looseness. It is made to cover phenomena of a heterogeneous nature. But Dr. Powicke is right in using it where he does. He points out that George Fox and Cromwell at once understood one another. And why? Because they had a temperamental sympathy; theirs was the affinity of genuine mysticism, which drew them together. Now Baxter, for all his learning and ability of character, "was no mystic. The mystic's heights and depths of feeling, and flashes of insight, and often confused intellectual processes, were outside his ken. They were, therefore, outside his faith; and he was not the first, or the last, to set down the mystic as a charlatan."

* * * * *

Baxter misunderstood Cromwell. And earlier in the century there is another instance of misconception. Men do not always realise the meaning of their own age; they may fail to do justice

to what is happening around them no less than to some specific individual. Sometimes good men fail here. They seem handicapped by their very goodness, which makes them unduly optimistic. Were they less pious, we are tempted to think, they would be more acute and alive to the contemporary situation. They are good, but their judgment is not good. And Bishop Lancelot Andrewes is a case in point.

* * * * *

Andrewes had to breathe the tainted air of the English Court. He was a saintly bishop, though he was not above the superstitions and prejudices of his age, Historians have sometimes been puzzled to understand how he could ignore what went on under his eyes. Did he see it ? Or, seeing it, did he wilfully shut his eyes to it ? Was he one of those who love the Lord but do not hate evil ? Probably Mr. Gairdner's explanation is more just, as it is more subtle. The bishop, says Mr. Gairdner, was spotless and gentle. " Going in and out as he did amongst the frivolous and grasping courtiers who gathered round the king, he seemed to live in a peculiar atmosphere of holiness, which prevented him from seeing the true nature of the evil times in which his lot had fallen." It is not the highest type of holiness. Certainly it is not the holiness of the Old Testament. Indeed it is nearer to the amiable, deluded spirit which characterises the opinions of a man like Marcus Aurelius upon some of his notorious relatives and contemporaries. But it is at any rate less to be censured than the spirit which swayed Baxter into a false judgment upon Cromwell.

* * * * *

The Bishop of Durham has published, in *Quo Tendimus?*, the charge delivered by him to the clergy of his diocese in November, and added a Cambridge sermon upon " The Divine Guidance." The text of the sermon is taken from the decree passed by the Jerusalem Council of the Church, in Acts xv. 28 : " For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us." For the bishop's theme is the divine guidance which is claimed by the corporate church. He asks how this bold formula can be taken over by church councils for their official decisions. Indeed his question falls into two parts. Through what instruments does this divine guidance find intelligible expression ? For what subjects may it be rightly claimed ?

Dr. Henson is clear that church councils are not suitable media. Take even the Council of Jerusalem. It was a council of the undivided Church, the earliest and most apostolic of all councils. But its decisions were not final; they were addressed to a need of the age, and, as Hooker admitted, this very law, inspired by the Spirit, "is abrogated by decease of the end for which it was given." Nor can subsequent councils claim a greater measure of divine guidance. Dr. Henson will not allow even Dr. Gore's claim on behalf of the Œcumenical Councils. He fastens upon Dr. Gore's admission that some of the General Councils leave a "disagreeable moral impression upon our minds," and pointedly asks if the action of the Holy Spirit ought not to be specially manifest in the moral sphere.

* * * * *

As for the second part of the question, Dr. Henson argues that Christians cannot expect, simply in virtue of their Christianity, any special illumination upon such complex and difficult problems as those raised, for example, by "Copec." He had already, in his charge, criticised the "Copec" conference. He now protests against the notion that devotion can be a substitute for hard thinking and practical experience, such as are required for any political or economic programme. "There is no short and easy way for Christians through the labyrinths of the social problem."

* * * * *

What then is the bishop's conclusion. There is such a thing as divine guidance, but, he explains, "we may only concede to ecclesiastical decisions so much weight as their intrinsic quality may justify, and of that in the last resort the private judgment of the individual Christian must decide. That private judgment, exercised responsibly, reverently, and intelligently is the final authority." In matters of social service, again, the individual Christian has a motive which, apart from his religion, he would not possess, a motive, an inspiration, and a source of wisdom. The "constraining power of Christ's Love is the never-failing spring of Christian philanthropy."

* * * * *

Mr. Augustine Birrell contributes to the *Congregational Quarterly* for July an entertaining article on Dr. Doddridge. He devotes most of his space to the nonconformist activities of his

hero, who chanced to be born in the seventeenth century, which, as Mr. Birrell remarks, "was everywhere a troublesome one for the proprietors of delicate consciences." Doddridge's father had a delicate conscience, and so had his son. Had he been less scrupulous about subscription, he might have become a bishop, and he would have been an honour to the episcopate. For, as Mr. Birrell declares, "the pious, learned, and dignified leaders of Nonconformity, bewigged, begowned, and banded, of Doddridge's day, were far better representatives of the piety, sobriety, and reverence for divine things within the Church of England than were the Paleys, the Warburtons, the Hurds, and the Hoadleys of the period."

* * * * *

Doddridge as a boy learned the Bible-stories from the pictures on Dutch tiles on the fire-place, explained to him by his mother. So the story goes. Such tiles are still to be seen. One wishes they were used for the same good purpose. Nowadays there is more known about the Bible than of the Bible, I am afraid. There are dozens of people who will leap into a passionate enthusiasm for the Authorised English Version, for example, as if it was the real Bible, and yet it requires little experience to know that three-fifths of all this is merely lip-service. They praise the English Bible, but do they read it? Have they ever been taught it? A clever reporter on one of our daily newspapers came to me lately for an interview, and calmly informed me that by way of preparation for the ordeal he had sent down to the office for a copy of the Bible. And why? To find out—for he was uncertain—whether the psalms were in the Old Testament or in the New Testament! Something is wrong here with our education, either in schools or in the home. Probably if there were more mothers like Doddridge's, the English Bible would not be so often, like Shakespeare, more praised than perused.

THE NABOPOLASSAR CHRONICLE AGAIN.

To one who is not by nature a born partisan or crusader it cannot but seem, on any candid estimate, that controversy is the least profitable of all the occupations which may engage and abuse the diligence of a man, and particularly of a scholar. For, if truth be struck out from the shock of opinions, it is neither the flint nor the steel which will perceive it, nor can the beholders (for whose benefit the process is intended) be sure of catching it among the shower of attendant sparks. Yet in this possibility, slight as it may be, lies all the justification that I can plead for indulging an activity so plainly vicious in itself. Since the publication, in 1923, of the highly important Babylonian Chronicle concerning the reign of Nabopolassar and the fall of Nineveh, many very kind notices have appeared in British and foreign journals, both learned and lay, invariably couched in courteous terms, even when it was evident—as it was in one or two cases—that the writers held me a notable sinner against the light, whether the direct ray of Scriptural authority, or the more mediate illumination of the doctrines of "British Israel." If, therefore, the object of this paper is to attempt some defence against criticisms which have appeared in different quarters, it is undertaken out of no personal feeling, nor with the over-sanguine hope of persuading the critics against their own opinions, but merely because it appears that a certain number of scholars, whom the original interest of the text could not fail to attract, has been disturbed by the doubts or amendments suggested by these writers. These enquirers have, therefore, a right to any further satisfaction that such a reply as this may afford them. For myself, I should have been better content to hold my peace and believe that truth is strong and will prevail.

The degree of restraint that is imposed by the consciousness of writing for an official publication is perhaps less well understood abroad, where a more personal colour is not considered inappropriate to such circumstances. One who has the honour to make available for study, under the auspices of the Trustees of the British Museum, an important document in the collections over which they preside, ought, however, to consider that he is charged to speak as objectively as possible, to present the facts to the best of his ability, but to abstain from obtruding himself by means of remoter inferences and by the inclusion of doubtful matter. This limitation is salutary, because it does not befit that such a publication should stand in danger of becoming obsolete through the eventual refutation of much that it contains. Yet it is, in fact, this unwillingness to trespass beyond the bounds of the text which is the main complaint that Dr. Lewy,[1] of Giessen, has against me. In particular, he is pained to see that I have not realised the all-important service of the new chronicle in fixing the whole of the Jewish chronology "from 639 to 586," nor triumphantly followed its thread into the heart of every labyrinth of history from the Ægæan to the Persian Gulf. Dr. Lewy, indeed, looks from within and from above, whence every forthright and mæander is plain. But let us see if the thread could really guide all the stumbles of such a Theseus as our critic would have desired to grasp it. Be it understood, however, that I am not careful to excuse myself for the lack of "tiefes Eindringen in den Stoff," by which is apparently meant an effort to reconstruct the whole history of the years which extend between the end of Ashurbanipal's records and the middle of Nebuchadrezzar's reign; the unsuitability of any such attempt to

[1] *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, November, 1924. Sp. 648–653, one of the articles already mentioned.

the first publication of a new document must be self-evident. Rather will it be my concern to inquire what justification there may be for certain conclusions which these critics draw from some divergent interpretations of the text.

First, then, it is claimed that the third line, properly understood, gives the long-sought date of Nabopolassar's revolt against Assyria ; it should, we are told, be translated, " in the month of Ab [616], the Assyrian army was assembled in the town of Qablini, and N. rebelled against them." The first remark to be made upon this is that it looks like an extraordinary hysteron-proteron, seeing that Nabopolassar had already spent three months of the year in subduing Assyrian provinces, before his " rebellion " took place ! And does one " rebel against " an army ? It is difficult to attach any meaning to such language, and Babylonian scribes were not in the habit of writing nonsense. Next the suggested translation is obtained by hardly less grammatical than logical violence. It is perhaps possible, however difficult, to regard *ik-kaš-šam-ma* as IV. 1. Pret. from the rare verb *kašâšu* (" they were assembled "), but on what grounds are we invited to this exercise of faith ? Merely on Dr. Lewy's unsupported assertion that *iq-bi-u-ma*, " they said,"—the plain reading of the signs—is " im Neubabylonischen unmöglich," the value of which can be tested by the most obvious expedient of consulting the glossary to Langdon's " *Neubabyl. Königsinschriften* "[1] under the verb *qabû*. This, apart from the reluctance to affirm with quite so much dogmatism what is and what is not " possible " in Babylonian writing. *Difficilior lectio præstantior* is not a commandment to substitute ingenuity for

[1] Where the form *iq-bé-u* is quoted, though seemingly with a wrong reference. Others could doubtless be found. Meanwhile we may content ourselves with an entirely analogous case in Clay, *Babyl. Records in the Library of J. Pierpont Morgan*, Part IV, No. 6, l. 27 *i-nam-du-u*, which alternates with l. 38, *RU-di-u*, i.e. *inamdiu*.

reason. And, while I have no wish to deny that *šaqû* can mean "to rebel," if such a sense makes nonsense of one passage we are not to accept it simply because it is appropriate to another.[1] But, in truth, it is superfluous to argue such details, for our critic's claim that 616 was the year of Nabopolassar's revolt can be summarily rejected on the best of all testimony, namely, that of the native records. The tablet B.M. 86379 (published in Mr. Smith's *Babyl. Historical Texts*, Plate IV, Rev. 4–6), states definitely, "After Kandalanu, in the accession year of Nabopolassar, there were revolts (*saḫmašati*) in Assyria and Akkad; the war continued and there were perpetual battles." That is, Nabopolassar revolted immediately after his accession. In seeking to fix this event between 620 and 617 I was wrong. But not so far wrong as my critic. And with regard to the fortunes of Sippar my "Ausführungen" remain, in themselves, perfectly valid. I need not quote more of Dr. Lewy's words here, for I should have to turn them upon himself.

Secondly, it is declared that the phrase *ṭubtu u sulummu itti aḫameš iškanu* (l. 29) is a technical term in Babylonian chronicles, implying "nicht mehr als eine Art Waffenstillstand oder Friedensschluss." Dr. Lewy himself translates it "(Wieder-) Gutsein und Versöhnung untereinander festsetzen." It would be tedious to discuss in detail the passages of the chronicles in which this phrase occurs; they are here subjoined in a note,[2] which the curious may use as they think fit. Suffice it to say that I, at least, can discover in them no ground for a distinction which is, in itself, probably

[1] Though far from certain even there. Bab. Chron. III, 39, 40 need not mean more than that Zeru-kenu-lishir "went up" from the seahand to besiege Ur, even as Nabopolassar, in our passage, went up (the Euphrates) to meet the Assyrian army.

[2] Synchronous Hist. Col. II, 27, 28, and Col. III, 18, 24. King, *Chronicles*, II, 58.

more obvious to us than it would have been to the ancient East. There is no evidence for the practice of the armistice among the Babylonians and the neighbouring nations. And, if it be right to refer to this occasion (614), the Greek tradition of a marriage between Nebuchadrezzar and the daughter of the Median king, something very much more than any "kind of armistice" is obviously indicated. I am well aware that Dr. Lewy would deny this attribution, since he actually wishes to postpone the marriage to 584. It is no part of my intention to discuss this view, which I must venture to call extremely hazardous, as being almost wholly irreconcilable with the tradition as we have it. But it is not without interest to inquire why he bears with such weight upon the distinction which he has sought to establish. And here we return to facts and to the Nabopolassar Chronicle.[1] He would apparently find in the account of the year 612 that, after the fall of Nineveh, Kyaxares was driven out of Assyrian territory by the Scythians with (at least) the connivance of the Babylonian king. Hence his desire to prove that Nabopolassar stood in nothing more than an armed truce with Kyaxares. This postulate is then made the foundation (if I understand Dr. Lewy's "Skizze" aright) for a subsequent theory to account for the celebrated twenty-eight years' Scythian domination attested by Herodotus. How the enormous difficulties which confront this theory in the region of the Greek evidence are to be surmounted is my critic's business, not mine. But when we are invited to believe (1) that the Chronicle for 612 records or implies a defeat of Kyaxares, and (2) that the latter "returned to his land" (Media) in l. 47 and yet reaches Naṣîbîn (N.W. of Nineveh) in l. 48,

[1] Dr. Lewy "Chronik G(add) lieber nennen möchte." I must beg leave to observe that Dr. Lewy's preference is not in question. It seems ungracious to decline an intended compliment—but there is an officious civility.

we shall reply that Dr. Lewy must show cause. Philip, indeed, was found at Azotus, but we are not required to include the seventh century in the age of miracles. It looks like a desperate effort to wrench the evidence in favour of a baseless presupposition.

At this point it is perhaps as well not to omit a few words upon the identity of those who took part in the final siege of Nineveh and the subsequent fighting at Harran. It has been freely asserted by some scholars [1] that the Umman-Manda, throughout this chronicle, are no other than the Medes themselves. Let it be granted at once that the name Umman-Manda is used to designate the subjects of the Median empire in certain passages,[2] which refer to Astyages.[3] But this is, at the most an inexact usage, and nobody claims that *Manda* is actually the same as *Madai*; the occurrence of the former in the Hittite Laws is, in itself, sufficient to discountenance such a notion. The point at issue, therefore, is whether we have to reckon with a similar confusion (if confusion it be) in the Nabopolassar Chronicle. First, then, it is significant that the chronicler has no reason to make this mistake, since he speaks of the Medes (*Madai*) plainly enough in years 11 and 12, and of Kyaxares as their leader no less definitely. In year 14, despite the mutilation of the text, it is tolerably certain that the "king of the Umman-Manda," or his host, is described as meeting Nabopolassar before

[1] Professors Meissner and Olmstead, and, most recently, Dr. Schnabel (*Zeitschr. f. Assyr.*, N.F. II, 82).

[2] Cf. "Fall of Nineveh," p. 14, n. 1, and Nabonidus-Cyrus Chronicle Col. II, 2. In these instances, however, it is not clear that there is any real confusion, since the empire of Astyages doubtless included some of the Umman-Manda, properly so called, i.e. the remains of the Kimmerians and of the Scythians.

[3] It is needless to reiterate my former remarks about the Ḥillah inscription of Nabonidus, which also enjoy (it is pleasant to find) the support of Dr. Lewy.

the junction with Kyaxares. And if, in year 16, the chronicler is referring to the Medes, why does he suddenly call them *Umman Manda* when they have hitherto been *Madai*? It is surely over-bold, then, to say that "no passage of the Chronicle compels us to regard Umman-Manda and Medes as non-identical." But, even before the appearance of this Chronicle, there was adequate ground in the Ktesian tradition of Diodorus for supposing the presence of a third force, neither Babylonian nor Median, at the destruction of Nineveh, and that force could be none but the Scythians of Herodotus. Against this evidence, which agrees so well with that of the Chronicle (as originally interpreted), the mere fact that Josephus names "Medes and Babylonians" as the opponents of Necho does not seem sufficient to enlist unhesitating preference for his account.

Now for the "certain recovery of the Jewish chronology from 639 to 586." Upon what does this rest? Upon the *assumption* that 609 was the year of Megiddo. Perhaps it was, though Dr. Allis,[1] of Princeton, would not believe it. But what must on no account be forgotten is that this is no more than an assumption; to speak as if it were attested by the Chronicle is to go far beyond the brief. That the document makes no specific mention of the battle at Megiddo is, of course, obvious. All we are told is that, in 609, there was an Egyptian army co-operating with Ashur-uballiṭ II. in his attempt to recover Harran.[2] If one decides to conclude from this that Necho was present at the head of this army, and that he had won his way to the Euphrates over the body of Josiah, so be it. But the Chronicle vouches

[1] *Princeton Theological Review*, July, 1924.

[2] Dr. Lewy holds that he did recover it with the aid of his Egyptian reinforcements. I can see no proof of this, and think there is distinct evidence to the contrary. But it is perhaps idle to dispute about so mutilated a passage.

for none of these things. On the other hand, we shall remember that Egyptian expeditions to the Euphrates were a persistent feature of these years,[1] and that the Chronicle ends at 609. The selection of that year's expedition as the one which included Megiddo may be justified, but hardly deserves so resounding an epithet as "sicher." Dr. Allis, indeed, does not believe there was an Egyptian army on the Euphrates at all in 609. I cannot go bail that there was, but he is at least entitled to my poor assurance that the Chronicle says so. It is impossible to represent in any copy of a cuneiform text the true appearance of the original, but that *umman* ^{mat}*mi-ṣir* actually stands in line 66 of the text is not open to serious doubt, as any competent scholar is at liberty to assure himself by inspection of the tablet. In view of which it is unnecessary to dwell longer upon the textual arguments of Dr. Allis. But it is next objected that, even if there was an Egyptian army, the context does not permit us to assert that it was in alliance with Ashur-uballiṭ, a circumstance which I am charged with assuming from the position in 616. True enough, but the grounds of that assumption are moderately strong :—(1) the known facts of 616 ; (2) the direct statement of Josephus about the Megiddo year, whichever that was ; (3) the final battle of Carchemish. In all cases Egypt is fighting the same enemy, and the onus of proof rests, therefore, upon those who would affirm the contrary for 609. It is difficult to understand Dr. Allis' disclaimer (p. 472), "we are not concerned to determine what Ashur-uballiṭ did to or with this Egyptian army." On the contrary, his case makes it imperative for him to do so, if he wishes to reject the obvious explanation.

The further objections upon which Dr. Allis' extreme unbelief is founded do not appear worthy of detailed

[1] "Fall of Nineveh," p. 16.

criticism. It must suffice to say : (*a*) that the chronicler's bias need not be supposed to include a Voltairian antipathy to the Scriptures ; (*b*) that the Chronicle contains no statement in support of the "several good reasons why the Egyptian Pharaoh might, in 608 or thereabout, have been making an expedition against the king of Assyria" ; and (*c*) that the Necho who is represented (p. 746) as setting out to fight, but uncertain whom he proposes to fight, was surely a very King Quixote ! The end of the whole matter is that Dr. Allis is seriously alarmed because the Old Testament appears to be impugned. And yet the remedy is in his own hands ; he even adverts to it, half unwittingly :— "Josephus' . . . statement may, for all we know to the contrary, be in entire accord with Kings and Chronicles" (p. 473). When the "Fall of Nineveh" was being written, Mr. Sidney Smith made the excellent suggestion to me that the apparent divergence of the Old Testament and Josephus could be very simply reconciled by the mere admission that עלה על can bear other than a hostile sense, that Necho "went up to" join, not to fight, the King of Assyria. It was only the negative opinion of a very distinguished Hebraist which prevented this from appearing in the book. Since then the same way out has, I believe, been independently suggested in a Jewish journal, but a pronouncement by Old Testament scholars would be very welcome. Meanwhile, it may at least be recommended as an anodyne to those who would otherwise resort to more desperate remedies.

C. J. Gadd.

THE BOOK OF JOB AND THE EARLY PERSIAN PERIOD.

In the third Isaiah—of which a good deal was probably written between 520 and 460—there seems to be evidence for the continuance of depressing conditions in Judea after 520, if any such evidence were required.[1] And, as already remarked, the state of the Persian empire was, although prosperous on the whole, not such as to permit any slackening of the rigorous general taxation which must have weighed with great severity on the young colony in Judea. Darius was obliged to maintain relatively large military forces—to rule with חַיִל and כֹּחַ—merely to keep his huge empire together, although his policy was one of conservation rather than of aggression. As to this last point, it is clear that the expedition to Attica, which ended so disastrously at Marathon, was undertaken as a precautionary measure in order to secure the Mediterranean frontier. Already, in the time of Cyrus and Cambyses, it had been necessary for the Persian government to make use of Phœnician navies in order to defend the Ionian coast, which they were obliged to hold if they were not to contemplate retreat from Asia Minor. Thuc. I.13 :—

> Later, in the time of Cyrus, the first Persian king, and of Cambyses his son, the Ionians had a large navy ; they fought with Cyrus, and were for a time masters of the sea around their own coasts.

And the subsequent policy of Darius, which determined his action in first securing the Ionian islands and afterwards undertaking a punitive expedition against Attica, did not aim at any permanent extension of territory (whatever may have been the case with his successor) and was only

[1] Cf. L. E. Browne : *Early Judaism*, and J. Marty : *Les chapîtres* 56–66 *du Livre d'Ésaïe.*

the logical continuance of the course adopted by his predecessors, as is evident from what Thucydides further says (I.16) :—

> The Ionians had attained great prosperity when Cyrus and the Persians, having overthrown Crœsus and subdued the countries between the river Halys and the sea, made war against them and enslaved the cities on the mainland. Afterwards Darius, strong in the possession of the Phœnician fleet, conquered the islands also.

Beyond the date of Marathon, it is perhaps hardly necessary to pursue the history of events. Persian maritime operations in the regions of Syria and Asia Minor can have brought no relief to the inhabitants of the province עבר נהרא. They must have been subject to the corvée, to regular taxes or tribute, to special levies, and probably also to military conscription. So far from the expectations of Zechariah being fulfilled, it is probable that numbers of the younger people left Judea altogether to go further west, either in the service of the Persians or on commercial ventures of their own. There were probably, even certainly, already Jewish metics in Ionia and the Ægean islands before the time of this prophet. (Cf. Isa. xi. 11.)

> Yahweh shall set his hand again the second time to recover the remnant of his people which shall be left, from Assyria, and from Egypt, and from Pathros, and from Cush, and from Elam, and from Shinar, and from Hamath, and from the islands of the sea.[1]

We now turn to questions of internal evidence, and first let us glance briefly at the claim already put forward that Job was a devoted student, if not a personal disciple, of the Second Isaiah, and that this study has left evident marks both on the language and on the imagery of his book. In dealing with this question I venture to put aside the rather sceptical conclusion of Canon Kennett, who

[1] Cheyne in his *Schweich Lectures* assigns this passage to the second century B.C., but, as it would seem, on *a priori* grounds.

seems to consider that the book is largely a patchwork of oracles, to most of which no very definite dates can be assigned. With great deference I remain unconvinced, and venture to take my stand on the opinion of Mr. L. E. Browne that the servant-songs are the work either of the author of the bulk of the rest of the book, or of some very close associate belonging to the same group and period—namely, the years immediately before and after 538 B.C. As to the book of Job itself, I suggest that although the prose story belongs to the early years of the author's life (assuming that it *is* his own work), yet the rest of the book, with the exception of the Elihu-section, is definitely by the same person. These, at all events, are the hypotheses on which I have based my further remarks.[1]

In the first place then, as the result of a by no means thorough or exhaustive examination of Job and of Deutero-Isaiah, I have picked out about 130 words which occur with frequency or with peculiar significance in both writings, and seem to have been favourite words with both authors.

First of all, a group of similes frequent in both compositions is that drawn from the phenomena of vegetation and of agricultural operations, e.g., "The cut grass withereth, the blossom fadeth." "A root out of a dry ground." "Like chaff before the wind." Words and expressions common to both here, are amongst others: יוֹנֵק, a young plant; מֹץ, chaff; קַשׁ stubble; (cf. קַשׁ נִדָּף of Isa. xli. 2 with עָלֶה נִדָּף and קַשׁ יָבֵשׁ of Job xiii. 25); נֶזַע, a tree-stock; יְבוּל, agricultural produce, crop; סְעָרָה, the *sirocco* wind; חָצִיר, cut grass, and צִיץ, a blossom (cf. the יָבֵשׁ חָצִיר נָבֵל צִיץ of Isa. xl. 8 with the לִפְנֵי כָל־חָצִיר יִבָּשׁ and כְּצִיץ יָצָא וַיִּמָּל of Job xiv. 2, viii.

[1] Sellin compares this book to *Faust*, supposing that its composition was spread over many years, and that it was subjected to many revisions and received many additions from the hand of one author.

12; cf. also Job xxi. 18); אֶרֶץ צִיָּה for dry or parched ground and the common roots שרשׁ, נטע, זרע, and in particular צמח, to sprout, spring up, which is a favourite with both writers, and is especially interesting because of its technical use in the contemporary Zechariah as an epithet of the Anointed.

Again, we find a group of words referring to the manual labourer, to physical exhaustion, to the corvée, to hire and hired workers, such as צָבָא, and the roots לאה, to be tired, , to be weary, and יגע, to faint, the last two a pair found frequently, both separately and together, in our two authors, as in Isaiah xl. 30. Cf. Job vii. 1–2:

הֲלֹא־צָבָא לְאֱנוֹשׁ עֲלֵי־אָרֶץ
וְכִימֵי שָׂכִיר יָמָיו

with Isa. xl. 2: מָלְאָה צְבָאָהּ

Similes drawn from flame (לֶהָבָה), fire (אֵשׁ), sparks (זִיקוֹת, רֶשֶׁף) are also favoured by both; so is imagery drawn from craftsmanship, especially that of the goldsmith or metal-worker, and the joiner: צֹרֵף and חָרַשׁ.

There are several characteristic words for road, path, highway, אֹרַח, מְסִלָּה, נְתִיבָה, common in both sources, and others for natural features, such as the frequent combination הָרִים וּגְבָעוֹת, and גַּיְא, a valley; for the seasonal streams and pools and artificial water-courses, מַיִם, נְהָרִים, אֲגַמִּים, and for clouds and mists, עָב and עָנָן or עֲנָנָה, also for the heavens and the stars (Isa. xliv. 22; Job iii. 5).

Many of these words are, of course, common enough, but the liking for similar imagery evidenced by their use in both books is surely interesting. The fact that such imagery is not infrequent in the later Wisdom Literature does not make the parallels between the earlier Job and Deutero-Isaiah less noteworthy, perhaps. I think that both authors were familiar with the wide plains and brilliant

star-lit nights of Babylonia, and that the passage in which Job describes the caravans' fruitless search for water in the dry beds of the wádys was written by one who had himself experienced what he describes during his journey to the Promised Land.

Several miscellaneous roots seem to be favourites in both works. I have noted צֶאֱצָאִים (offspring), ערך to display, arrange, set in order, צלח to prosper, and נאל, so frequent in Second Isaiah, and so well known in the much-disputed passage in Job.

Finally, a number of wisdom words for good and evil qualities are found in both sources, such as חסד, תבונה, עונה, חרפה, אמת, צדקה and others.

I would mention also the phrase :—

כֻּלָּם כַּבֶּגֶד יִבְלוּ עָשׁ יֹאכְלֵם

with which compare Job iv. 19 :—

אַף שֹׁכְנֵי בָתֵּי־חֹמֶר אֲשֶׁר בֶּעָפָר יְסוֹדָם
יְדֻכְּאוּם לִפְנֵי עָשׁ.

Job xiii. 28 כְּבֶגֶד אֲכָלוֹ עָשׁ and Job xxvii. 18 בָּנָה כָעָשׁ בֵּיתוֹ. Again Isaiah l. 10, יִשָּׁעֵן בֵּאלֹהָיו may be compared with Job xxiv. 23 and Isaiah xlvii. 11, תָּבֹא פִתְאֹם שְׁאָה with Job xxx. 14.

Phrases and powers descriptive of the Divinity, and implying the ideas of sublime transcendence and of inscrutable sovereignty, are also typical of both works.

In this connexion we find the word חוג which occurs in these two books (Isa. xl. 22, Job xxvi. 10) in the sense of the circle of the earth, and of the waters. Other instances might be adduced, but there is not time for an exhaustive analysis, nor do I wish to rest my case on such a comparison alone.

In these last paragraphs I have already brought forward a good deal of the evidence with which I hope to support the

view of Job's career already outlined. The author had once been the owner of wealth, the master of a numerous household, the possessor of a wide circle of friends, the administrator of justice:

As I was in the days of my youth, when the secret presence of God rested upon my household;
When the Almighty was yet with me, my children around me;
When I used to go out through the city to the gateway, used to arrange my seat in the square;
The young men saw me and effaced themselves, the aged stood up respectfully.

(Job xxix. 4–8; cf. Job xix. 13, 16.)

He speaks of pleading his cause (xxiii. 4), אֶעֶרְכָה לְפָנָיו מִשְׁפָּט and very frequently of the manners and customs of the wealthy as well known to him. On the other hand, he was, as I have shown, familiar with the racking toil of the labourer on the land, the hired ploughman and harvester, who longs for the shadow, and with *res angustae domus*, the בָּתֵּי חֹמֶר of the peasant, hunger, thirst and insufficient clothing. If he had lived in Babylonia and traversed the desert, and if subsequently most of his life had been passed as a cultivator and small farmer in the uncertain climate of the Judean hills, we could explain a great deal of his poem as embodying his own experience, an experience which culminated in a lonely and poverty-stricken old age. I like to compare Job to Milton. Surely both had been "exposed to feel what wretches feel." To both the situation of blind Samson, as Milton pictures him, was an awful fact —

Oh dark! dark!! dark!!! unutterably dark!!!!

The life with which Job, in his maturer years, was most familiar was exactly, it seems, the life pictured in Haggai and Zechariah. He too had known what crop-failures, blasting and mildew meant; what it was to have no money for the hire of men or beast; what it was to live a life void

equally of children's laughter and of the pleasant ripe leisure of normal old age.

But it is in our third portion of evidence that the witness of Zechariah is most valuable. As far as Babylonian science and Babylonian religious notions are concerned we need only quote the mention of the piercing of Rahab and the battle with Tiamat, where it is clear that Job, like Isaiah, is using the old myth in its Jewish form, where Yahweh takes the place of Marduk. (Cf. Isa. li. 9–10)—

> Art thou not (O arm of Yahweh) that which made mincemeat of Rahab, and gave death-blows to the sea monsters ?
> Art thou not that which dried up the sea, the waters of the mighty Deep ?

with Job xxvi. 12) :

> He (Yahweh) stilleth the sea with his mighty strength and smiteth Rahab by his wisdom.

There is, I think, no evidence of Zoroastrian influence in the poetic part of Job. Such evidence might be the mention of angels (*fravashis*), demons (*daevas*), *seven* divine spirits (*amesha spentas*), or immortality, and of eschatological conceptions of any sort. But our poet is silent in all these regards. He was not a believer in personal immortality ; he has abandoned his earlier Messianic hopes ; he is a monotheist of an extraordinarily clear and perfect type.

Quite otherwise is it with regard to the little prose (?) piece which forms prologue and epilogue to the poem. We have here a number of guardian spirits, one of whom is developing into a sort of counter guardian spirit, and is described as the opposer or adversary (השטן). Dillmann says that Satan in Job is certainly one of God's servants, but that " he is here on the point of becoming an evil being, though he has not actually become so, else he would not

be reckoned as one of the angels", and Stave remarks that he here betrays "eine innere Schadenfreude".

The Satan who withstands (root שטן) Joshua the high priest in Zechariah's writings is a very similar being. Here, too, we have mention of good angels. Stave says, "In Zechariah the angelology has been subjected to a development not uninfluenced by Parsism. If this angelology was subsequently developed in a way which bears unmistakable marks of its connexion with Parsism, Satan also retains several traces which remind us involuntarily of his Parsisian counterpart."

That the Jews must have come into contact with Persian religion both in its old Magian and its more refined Zoroastrian form, is almost certain. We know that *fravashis* or guardian spirits and *daevas* or evil demons were characteristic of the Magian system, if it can be called a system, and were absorbed into later Judaism, being especially notable features of its more intensive form, Pharisaism.

For the Sadducees say that there is neither resurrection, nor angel, nor spirit; the Pharisees, on the contrary, affirm the existence of both.

Even the Second Isaiah speaks of having been sent by the Lord and his spirit—

אדני יהוה שלחני ורוחו (Isa. xlviii. 16),

and there is a well-known relief of Darius at Persepolis standing before a winged figure which seems to represent the *fravashi* of Ahura Mazda. It is true that it is not always easy or even possible to distinguish here Babylonian and Persian influences, or these again from native Hebrew religious notions. Yet whatever be the origin of the רוּחַ as distinguished from Yahweh himself, it does seem difficult not to identify the seven-eyed (seven-facetted) stone of Zechariah :—

Seven eyes on one stone,

Pacific School of Religion Berkeley, Calif.

and the gold lampstand with its seven pipes and seven lamps :—

> A lampstand all of gold, with a bowl upon the top of it and its seven lamps on this and seven pipes going to the lamps which are upon the top of it.

Surely this duplicated image represents the seven-fold *amesha spenta*, the seven personified qualities which proceed from *Ahura Mazda* and of which he is the creator and essential being. Darmesteter thus translated Yasht xiii. 33 : " qui ont tous les sept la même action, dont la pensée est la même, la parole est la même, le créateur Ahura-Mazda."

Lastly, Zechariah has clearly the idea of the Lie, the *Druj* of Zoroaster, in mind, when he exhorts his countrymen not to love the oath of the lie (viii. 17).

It may be mentioned also that Zechariah's eyes, like Job's Satan, are " roving through all the earth " (iv. 10), and his horses are " to walk up and down " in the earth. Cf. Satan again. It may be asked why so much should be said about Zechariah in a paper dealing with the authorship of Job. The connexion is as follows. If Zechariah shows a knowledge of Magian and even Zoroastrian ideas in 520, of *fravashis* and *daevas*, of *Ahura Mazda* and the *amesha spentas*, and of the *Druj*, and if the prologue of Job contains mention of some of these beings under Hebrew names with similar meanings, and at a similar or nearly similar stage of development, then we may guess at a near-by date for this prologue. That such Zoroastrian influence was possible at this date is, I think, established. Cyrus—witness the Gadatas inscription—was clearly a Zoroastrian, as were both Cambyses and, of course, Darius.

Our author may well have written the prologue and epilogue just after the disappearance of the Davidic dynasty —it shows a vivid power of narrative, with a far less digested and connected, not to say a far more elementary, philosophy

of life. It contains, beside its Zoroastrian (or Magian) ideas (e.g. that the *daevas* [Satan] bring disease is distinctly stated in the Yashts), a Rabbinic conception of individual reward and retribution for individual Rabbinic virtues. Is not Job the typical good young man of the גּוֹלָה schools ?

Perfect and upright, fearing God and eschewing evil.

I suspect, however, that even in the prologue the author was already disillusioned, although he had not completely readjusted his ideas. Here he is the shrewd young satirist. The Job of the prologue should, according to the teaching of the sōphĕrīm, have enjoyed every blessing, and so he did—God corresponded exactly to the idea of His character taught in the schools of Babylon—orthodox goodness was rewarded with orthodox blessings—children, long life, riches. Can we not see the author's tongue in his cheek ?

Life is not like that. His Persian friends had shown him something of the problem of evil and had raised doubts in his mind. He was already, as the result of his first disappointment, recasting the too simple theology imbibed from his Rabbinic teachers. In the later poem all these half-digested ideas, Rabbinic morality, angels good and bad, the Rabbinic prig and the puckish Satan, are alike jettisoned. He joins issue once for all with the orthodox teaching of school and synagogue. He is no longer in the mood for raillery or for gentle satire. Bernard Shaw has become John Milton.

And in this great poem—a poem which, though essentially of the Wisdom school, is equally essentially the antithesis of Ezekielian teaching as far as its special problem is concerned, the old man asserts his sublime defiant faith. Isaiah had been wrong—the Messianic hope was an illusion. Ezekiel and the schools were wrong. Man does *not* always reap what he sows. And yet—wisdom *is* justi-

fied of her children. There is a truth behind the sublimity of Isaiah's conception of the world-ruler who weighs the stars in a balance and measures the heavens with a span. There is a truth behind the Babylonian legend of a good triumphant over misery and chaos. There is a truth behind the Zoroastrian teaching concerning light and truth victorious over the lie. Truth even somewhere behind the too smug morality and too mathematically exact retribution of the Gōlāh schools. God is sovereign. God is inscrutable.

Though He slay me
Yet will I trust in Him.

J. P. Naish.

THE TEN BEST BOOKS ON THE PARABLES OF JESUS.

The parables contained in the first three gospels are one of the methods employed by our Lord in His teaching. It is therefore impossible to isolate them strictly from the general teaching, and indeed much of the best discussion of them is to be found in the various biographies of our Lord as well as in any competent book upon His teaching, as, for example, in what seems to me the ablest life of Jesus, Keim's *Jesus of Nazara* (English translation, vol. iv., pp. 127 f.), or in Strauss's *Life of Jesus* (tr. George Eliot, § 78), in Professor Gardner's *Exploratio Evangelica* (ch. xvii.), T. G. Selby's admirable little book on *The Ministry of the Lord Jesus* (C. H. Kelly, 1896), or in Dr. E. A. Abbott's rich series, *The Fourfold Gospel*. Also, all the commentaries handle the parables. But the parables have had a literature of their own for over a century. One or two, like the parable of the Ten Virgins or that of the Dishonest Steward,

have for special reasons been discussed separately. But, from time to time, their distinctive features have commanded attention, in a more general way, and as they form a ripe topic for the preacher, it seems worth while to enumerate ten of the best books upon their meaning and function, in order to afford some guidance for those who desire either to study them critically or to understand them for the special purpose of preaching on them effectively.

The older works are not of much value, though Salmeron's volume *De Parabolis* (1602) marks the first serious attempt to treat the parables independently. Still, exposition or practical interpretation sometimes retains elements of usefulness, even when its historical basis must be abandoned. An exception ought to be made in favour of the *Commentarii* of the Spanish Jesuit Maldonatus in the sixteenth century; this work on the gospels shows a real grasp of what is vital. In another direction, preachers may still find material occasionally in an exposition like E. Greswell's elaborate *Exposition of the Parables* (Oxford, 1834), or in William Arnot's *Parables of our Lord* (Edinburgh, 1867), which has been often reprinted. But of all the English books belonging to this latter class, by far the most popular has been Archbishop Trench's *Notes on the Parables of our Lord.* It was published in 1841, and has been repeatedly re-issued. A convenient edition is published by Messrs. Routledge, with a preface by Dr. Smythe Palmer. Trench belongs to the school of interpreters who love to draw mystical meanings from the text, though he does exhibit more restraint than some of his predecessors along this line. He thinks, for example, in the parable of the Good Samaritan, that it is not "far-fetched to see in the inn the figure of the Church," and when the father in the story clothes the prodigal son with the best robe we are asked to believe that this means positively "the imputation to him of the merits and righteous-

ness of Christ." But Trench's book contains a store of material from ancient life and interpretation, which may be consulted with profit by the prudent, however antiquated and unsafe the method of exposition may be.

The first book in our language which seriously challenged the older moralising view and set itself to study the parables in the daylight of synoptic criticism was Professor A. B. Bruce's *Parabolic Teaching of Christ* (Hodder and Stoughton, 1882). Dr. Bruce had already dealt with the parables incidentally in his *Training of the Twelve* (Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark), a book of first-rate merit upon the teaching of Jesus, which ought to be in every clerical library. Dr. Bruce was a pioneer in this department. His book on the parables is characteristically brisk and practical. An air of reality breathes through its pages. It is a critical exposition, and historical criticism has, of course, progressed far since he wrote; yet there is much in this book which will never be antiquated. It concentrates upon what the parables meant for Jesus primarily, and it is sensitive to what Dr. Bruce felt to be the gracious, evangelic spirit of our Lord. Yet even as he was writing, a new chapter was being opened in the subject. His principle was that you can best learn what a parable is by reading it as Jesus spoke it. But the question now was raised, Do we know exactly how Jesus spoke the parables? And further, How is a parable, in the synoptic tradition, related as a literary form to its classical and Jewish antecedents? Such were the sort of questions proposed in 1888 by Adolf Jülicher in his large book *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*, whose two volumes were completed in 1899 (new editions, 1910). Jülicher's book is the beginning of all modern discussion. He sets himself to three tasks:—(i.) First, to analyse the special contents of a "parable." (ii.) To apply the methods of historical and literary criticism to the extant parables of Jesus. (iii.) To

expound them, on the basis of his critical method. A brief account of his work is printed in the *Encyclopædia Biblica* (2563–2567),[1] but the book itself requires to be read in order to gain an idea of what he has really achieved. It is a book of exceptional importance. For the first time the characteristics of the gospel parable as a literary form are fully discussed, with a minute analysis of the relevant texts. Here it must suffice to say that Jülicher argues that the "parable" was for Jesus a clear illustration of some vital truth, and that any allegorical interpretation is due to the interests and misapprehensions of the apostolic Church during the course of transmission. The parable originally belongs to the category of the similitude or fable; it is, in the hands of Jesus, a means of elucidating and applying his popular teaching, and that is why he uses apt comparisons drawn from more or less familiar life. Sometimes it may take the form of a narrative, but the details are not to be pressed into an allegorical meaning. There is a single point of comparison in a parable. The rest is decorative detail. Parables are invariably "illustrative instances which establish an abstract religious or ethical truth by the evidence of a concrete case." It is illegitimate to go further and read subtle meanings into the framework of the comparison, or to imagine that the parables were ever intended by Jesus to veil the truth from any of his hearers.

The ability and incisiveness of Jülicher's work soon started fresh investigation. He stimulated a re-examination of the subject, especially on the Continent. No more notable contribution was made than the work of the Scandinavian scholar Dr. C. A. Bugge. He had already written on the

[1] The best dictionary article is Heinrici's in the third edition of the *Real-Encyklopädie für protest. Theologie und Kirche* (vol. vii. 688–703); it was published in 1899.

parables, but in his *Haupt-Parabeln Jesu* (Giessen, 1903) he dealt with the question again in the light of Jülicher's arguments. His book resembles in form that of Dr. Bruce, but it naturally is more abreast of criticism. He shows in the first place that Jülicher had ignored unduly the use of the parable by Palestinian rabbis, and treated the parable too much along the lines of Aristotle. Then he proved that Jülicher had thereby failed to allow for the fact that a certain allegorising element could enter into a genuine parable. Having devoted a long introduction to this preliminary matter, he proceeds to expound six parables on the mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven, then seven of the later parables chronicled by Matthew, and finally the Lucan parables about individuals. Bugge provides a clear apt exposition of the text, and adds at the end of each some relevant specimens of earlier exegesis. His book thus combines criticism and exposition. In thoroughness it is perhaps the most satisfactory counterbalance to Jülicher for Lagrange's articles in the *Revue Biblique* (1909–1910) have not been reprinted, and anyhow they were not expository, while Weinel's compact, small volume, *Die Gleichnisse Jesu* (third edition, 1910), is upon the whole in the wake of Jülicher. Weinel's book is the best brief account, for popular purposes, of this critical attitude. Lagrange, of course, has treated the parables since then, in his commentaries, with characteristic precision. But the antithesis to Weinel, in size and spirit, was written not by Lagrange but by another Roman Catholic scholar, Professor L. Fonck whose *Parabeln des Herrn im Evangelium* (Innsbruck, 1902 third edition, 1909), a combination of criticism and exposition, voices the conservative critical position. This is a large, well-equipped volume, with dogmatic interests. The impetus given by Jülicher is also felt in the articles by Loisy which are reproduced in his *Études Évangeliques* (1902)

his later commentary elaborates the views here outlined.

The next important contribution was made by a Jesuit scholar, Dr. Buzy. In his *Introduction aux Paraboles Évangeliques* (Paris, 1912) he tackles the fundamental question of the significance of the " parable " as no one had done since Jülicher wrote. Buzy has learning. He confines himself to the preliminary data; he does not expound individual parables, but lays bare the underlying principles upon which any interpretation rests. Some of his points are well made. Thus he shows that the Old Testament " parable " and its rabbinic successors were not invariably obvious and clear. Again he brings forward evidence to prove that allegories need not be abstruse or enigmatic, as Jülicher and Loisy had incautiously held. He is not anti-critical, for he allows that a certain editorial work on the part of the evangelists may have affected the parables in their present form as e.g. in Luke viii. 5 and 12. But he makes out a good case for the theory that the occasional interpretations of the parables are not to be relegated entirely to the apostolic Church. There is no introduction which provides so comprehensive an account of the ancient " parable " and its cognate forms in literature, and among other things it demonstrates the weakness of Jülicher's rigid distinction between parable and allegory. It is only fair to add that Jülicher himself has admitted that his original position requires to be modified.

The recall of criticism to Palestine and Judaism was voiced simultaneously by P. Fiebig's *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu* (Tübingen), published in the same year. Fiebig had already written on the *Altjüdische Gleichnisse und die Gleichnisse Jesu*, but his later work supersedes the earlier. He shows, out of a competent knowledge of rabbinic literature, that a close study of rabbinic parables makes it impossible to follow Jülicher in rigorously excluding allegorical traits as

unauthentic. Bugge had hinted this; Fiebig proves it to the full. He prints specimens of the rabbinic parables to throw light upon the gospel parables, and though this only serves to bring out the obvious superiority of the latter, his proper argument is that the parables of Jesus must be understood in connexion with Jewish parables, not under the category of Aristotle's literary criticism. Neither Fiebig nor Bugge advocates, of course, the allegorical interpretation of the parables, such as had been in vogue until Jülicher finally shattered it. Both recognise the yeoman service rendered by Jülicher in freeing the interpretation of the parables from the arbitrary methods of the moralisers and the mystics. Nevertheless Fiebig's plea is that in the days of Jesus the "parable" might well include more than one point of comparison or illustration, and also that a rabbi sometimes interpreted his own parables. No more useful collection of the rabbinic parables is accessible than this for the purpose of exposition. Rabbi Asher Feldman, in *The Parables and Sayings of the Rabbis* (Cambridge, 1924), has recently supplemented it by amassing references to pastoral and agricultural topics, but his collection is not in the same class as Fiebig's.

In 1913 Mr. L. E. Browne published an Hulsean essay upon *The Parables of the Gospels*, a succinct study which deserves to be chronicled. Though brief, it furnishes the English reader with an outline of the data for acquiring a critical estimate of the subject. Those who have not access to Fonck or Weinel may profitably refer to his pages, especially if they add the sixth chapter of Mr. A. M. Rihbany's *The Syrian Christ* (Melrose, 1919), the relevant section in Wendt's *Teaching of Jesus* (vol. i., pp. 115 f.), and Dr. Denney's pages on "Criticism and the Parables" in the Expositor for August and September (1911).

Jesus, then, used parables, sometimes as illustrations,

sometimes as arguments—though the distinction is barely adequate, for an illustration may well become a popular argument. Furthermore, apart from the idiosyncrasies of the evangelists (e.g. Luke's fondness for soliloquies), the parables are substantially the reproduction of what Jesus actually said. In the course of transmission they have been edited, touched now and then by æsthetic, moralising and ecclesiastical influences,[1] but they must have come from Jesus Himself originally. The early Church had not the creative mind for this kind of thing; it produced many literary forms, but apparently the parable was beyond its powers. Thus, to quote only one scholar, Professor Burkitt (*Gospel History and its Transmission*, p. 195) admits that while the explanation of the parable of the Tares may be due to the later church, the parable itself is original. He adds, referring to Wellhausen, that he finds it "difficult to believe that the Parables and the Sayings which speak of the Kingdom of God as a thing to be realised here on earth would have retained so fresh and unecclesiastical an atmosphere, if they were both in spirit and in substance the work of an age later than our Lord. Nowhere in early Christian literature, except in those synoptic gospels, do we find that picturesque outlook upon man and nature that finds its expression in the Parables of Jesus." Similarly, the comparison between the parables of Jesus and those of the rabbis reveals the intrinsic superiority of the former. Jesus, for example, did not make trees or plants or animals speak. And He never used the parable as a means of Old Testament exegesis.

Three special problems arise in this connexion:—(*a*) One is the interpretation of the object of the parables as defined

[1] See on this the second volume of Dr. V. H. Stanton's *The Gospels as Historical Documents* (pp. 73 f., etc.), and, on the tendency to edit the parables, Canon Streeter's words in the *Oxford Studies in the Synoptic Problem*, pp. 197 f.

in Mark iv. 10–12, etc. Does Mark misinterpret Jesus here ? Were the parables intended in any respect to keep the truth a secret ? This difficulty occupies a large part of Buzy's work, and it is constantly discussed in articles like those by von Soden (*Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1911, pp. 190 f.), J. W. Hunkin (*Journal of Theological Studies*, 1915, April), Dr. Michael (EXPOSITOR, October, 1920), etc., as well as in modern commentaries. (*b*) Then there is the classification of the parables. Most expositors arrange them topically ; e.g. Bruce finds fourteen Theoretic parables, twelve parables of Grace, and seven parables of Judgment. But this method is rarely successful, It becomes artificial, as a rule. A subtle attempt along this line will be found in Westcott's *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels* (ch. vii.). In Goebel's good monograph on *Die Parabeln Jesu* (Gotha, 1880 ; an English translation is available, 1883) the order is chronological : the parables beside the lake, the parables of the middle period, and the Passion-parables. But Goebel complicates this with a topical arrangement which is unconvincing, for the idea of judgment, for example, is not confined to the last class. However, if a series of sermons were to be preached on the parables, this chronological arrangement is perhaps the least open to criticism ; it is natural and it is easily followed. (*c*) As for the analytic enumeration of the parables, opinions vary widely. Bruce, for example, discusses incidentally what he calls " parable-germs." Bugge more satisfactorily divides his material into three classes, parabolic or brief utterances, paradoxical sayings and parables proper. Yet such literary criticism does not lead to any assured results. As a metaphor may develop into an allegory, so a simile may grow into a parable or fable, no doubt ; yet the wide connotation of the *mashal* or Jewish prototype of the parable prepares us for an equal width of range in the latter's usage.

The term " parable " in the gospels (*παραβολή*) means once a proverb (Luke iv. 23), but otherwise it varies from a simple maxim (Luke xiv. 7) or obscure saying (Matt. xv. 11) to a comparison (Mark iii. 23 f.), or a developed comparison in the form of an illustration or story. Instead of elaborating varieties of " parable," it is better to rest content with some general definition like that suggested by Buzy, that " parable " in the gospels, like *mashal* in the Old Testament, " is a counsel of wisdom, in which the element of comparison is generally predominant, although here and there it may be absent."

As for expositions or practical applications of the parables, such books are numerous. The difficulty is to choose which are most likely to be helpful. Much depends upon individual taste here. But if one or two are necessary, I venture to name in the first place, without any hesitation, Dr. Marcus Dods's two small volumes, *The Parables of our Lord* (Hodder and Stoughton, 1886). The art of exposition, like the art of engraving, seems to have died out almost entirely nowadays. Dr. Dods was a master of it in the last generation. His books are second to none in this department. The only drawback to them is that, once you read an exposition of his, you feel that it is impossible to treat the parable otherwise. Dr. W. M. Taylor's *The Parables of our Saviour* (Hodder and Stoughton, 1889, 4th ed., 1894) is another larger work, full of sound edification. Dr. A. L. Lilley's *Adventus Regni* (Griffiths, 1907) may be safely commended, as illustrating a different theological outlook, and Mr. R. Winterbotham's *The Kingdom of Heaven* (Methuen, 1898) or Mr. George Murray's *Jesus and His Parables* (Edinburgh, 1914) shows how the parables may be explained effectively to an ordinary audience. Dr. H. B. Swete's posthumous volume, *The Parables of the Kingdom* (Macmillan, 1920), is an exposition of the Galilean and Judean parables specifically bearing

on the subject of the Kingdom. The Greek text of each is printed, with some quiet explanations of the theology which is involved. As the editors remark, the attractiveness of these lectures to candidates for Holy Orders is due to the author's power of combining "maturity of learning and insight with direct application to life." The only other volume which I single out in this connexion is the charming exposition by Dr James Drummond in the first series of *The Way of Life* (Lindsey Press, London, 1917), a devout and modern interpretation.

To sum up:—(*a*) For critical study—Bruce, Jülicher, Weinel, Bugge, Buzy, Fiebig, Fonck; or, for readers who prefer English, Browne. (*b*) For exposition in the main—Trench, Dods, Drummond, and either Goebel or anyone of the more modern books mentioned in the preceding paragraph.

James Moffatt.

THE FEEDING OF THE MULTITUDE.

The man who first wrote Mark viii. 1–10 cannot already have written Mark vi. 30–44. The disciples' question in viii. 4 is decisive. Had the writer thought of them as having already witnessed the feeding of the five thousand as related in chapter vi., he could not have written that they asked, "Whence shall one be able to fill these men with bread here in a desert place?" It could have been done only by a compiler arranging accepted material.

But if these two accounts were not originally from the same hand, then they are probably differing accounts of the same event, or, rather,—so close is the similarity,—different versions of the same account. In both we have the same points related in precisely the same order,—the gathering of the multitude: the statement of the need: the disciples'

perplexity: the enquiry as to their resources: the reply: the command to recline: the blessing and distribution of the loaves and of the fishes: the eating: the gathering of the fragments: the number of the multitude: the departure by boat. The verbal similarities too are considerable.

There can also be little doubt that of the two versions that of Mark viii. 1–10 is the more primitive and authentic. It gives the number as "about four thousand" as against the definite "five thousand" of vi. 44, and the process of tradition may be relied on to increase rather than diminish numbers. There is a noticeable difference in the part the disciples play. In chapter vi. they take the initiative both in noticing the need of the multitude and suggesting their dismissal, which is less likely than the account of chapter viii., where Jesus Himself takes the initiative. Then, too, if the multitude had been with Jesus three days in a desert place, it was an unusual circumstance more likely to call for unusual action than their presence with Him for only part of one day, as in chapter vi., a state of things that, according to Mark i. 45, frequently occurred. And the hunger of the multitude, as in viii. 2, is a more natural cause for the compassion of Jesus than, as in vi. 34, "because they were as sheep not having a shepherd," an expression hardly fitting those who were so eager to follow and learn of Him, and one that finds far better context in Matthew ix. 36, where it describes those to whom Jesus sent the Twelve.

And if Mark viii. 1–10 gives us the more primitive and authentic account, we cannot help seeing that the gathering could not have been of the accidental nature described in Mark vi. 33. No multitude of several thousand so gathered could have existed even for three days in "the wilderness." To have remained for so long they must have come prepared: that is, the gathering was not a crowd but a con-

ference. This conclusion is confirmed by the further statement that they were not all from one district—" some of them are come from far " (viii. 3).

And the demand in Mark viii. 11 for a sign from heaven suggests that there had been an immediately preceding action on the part of Jesus which the Pharisees considered themselves entitled to test. Now a deliberately organized gathering in the wilderness would in those troubled times be a grave concern to the authorities : but if the crowd had come against the will of Jesus, it would not have been to His opponents' advantage to canvass an extraordinary evidence of His popularity for which they could not make Him responsible.

And when we examine the account given in chapter vi. we find that it contains several self-contradictions of such a sort as to suggest that it is a conflation of two accounts, one of which told of a pre-arranged conference and the other of a promiscuous and accidental gathering. We are told that the multitude, by following, frustrated Jesus' desire to be alone with the Twelve, and yet that Jesus, by departing in view of thousands, omitted the simplest precaution to secure that end. We are told that the crowd was of such origin that it could observe the boat's departure and overtake it. Yet the destination was at some distance, probably on the other side of the lake, for the disciples, though they themselves could return by boat the same evening, ask Jesus not to send the multitude home but " into the country and villages round about " to buy food. We are told that this crowd saw Jesus and the disciples going, " and ran there . . . and outwent them." What are we to understand by " there " ? It implies a certain definite spot whither the crowd knew Jesus intended to go, though He had not yet arrived there, and whither it went and waited for Him, though we are given to understand that His

destination was unknown to the crowd. And the words "And He came forth and saw a great multitude" imply that the spot on which the multitude gathered was not visible until after landing. Yet if the origin of the crowd as given in verses 30–33 is correct, the only possibility open to them was to keep to the shore and see where the boat would land, in which case they would be visible from the water. But the most illuminating difficulty is when we are told that "they saw them going . . . and ran there together on foot from all the cities and outwent them." Strictly this tells us that Jesus' departure by boat was visible "from all the cities" and that people from each forthwith started in pursuit and were able to overtake Him, or else that those who saw took the news back to "all the cities" and then with others set out to follow and were still able to outgo the boat. Apart from the impossibility involved in any interpretation of which the words are capable as they stand, the further question arises,—If these people remained in the cities while Jesus was on the more accessible western side of the lake, how comes it that they show such intense eagerness to be with Him on the distant eastern side?

There can be little doubt that the dominant mental picture of the writer of vi. 33, 34 was that of a crowd already gathered on the western side who, seeing Jesus depart, ran some seven or eight miles round the lake (he tells of men—*ἄνδρες*—only, not "women and children" as Matthew) and, watching the course of the boat, met it as it came to land. But the discrepancies noted suggest that to this dominant picture he is trying to accommodate phrases originally embodying a different story, that told of a prearranged meeting place at a little distance from the eastern shore and of people who by appointment gathered "there" "from all the cities" and there awaited Jesus' coming (in v. 33 some authorities read *συνῆλθον αὐτοῦ* instead of

προῆλθον αὐτούς). So that the account of chapter vi. also seems, in spite of itself, to betray the fact that the gathering was an appointed conference.

If we may so understand it, then the occasion becomes clear. For we are told that the gathering followed immediately upon the return of the Twelve (Mark vi. 30), which suggests that it was the result of their mission. Their appointment took place after Jesus' fame had drawn crowds from all Palestine and even from other countries (Mark iii. 7, 8), and they were sent out either before or not long after Herod heard of Jesus (Mark vi. 7–16). And therefore, though some of them were with Jesus before their appointment, they cannot, prior to their first preaching, have had an adequate understanding of His teaching, and even later we are told more than once that they misunderstood Him. So that when we ask what was to be the next step for those who accepted their message, it is certain that these would want to come into personal contact with Jesus to hear for themselves the Teacher whose emissaries they had received. It is as certain that Jesus would want to see and speak to them.

The conclusion is that this multitude "from all the cities," some of whom came "from far," who met Jesus on the eastern side of the lake "in the wilderness" at the close of the mission of the Twelve and came prepared to spend more than one day on the spot, was not a promiscuous and incidental crowd, but was a deliberately convened conference of those who had accepted the message of the Twelve.

This explanation of the gathering helps to explain the story of the feeding, for if, in the light of it and without importing associations from elsewhere, we read the more primitive account of Mark viii. 1–10 we find the story perfectly intelligible and natural without any suggestion of

the miraculous. If the multitude had been there three days, they must have come provided with food. But some would be better provided than others and the necessity of which Jesus speaks in viii. 2 would arise when the less well provided would be without food, while the better provided would still have something in store. But there was evidently some hesitancy to act on the part of those who still had, due doubtless to the necessity of providing for the home journey. Jesus' action is simple. He asks the Twelve what is still in hand: He commands the whole multitude to recline as for a meal: then He gives thanks and distributes the whole of His own party's store. The hint is irresistible; those who still have cannot but see the point and rise to the challenge, and so all are fed and the Twelve collect in fragments more than they gave. On the other hand to insist on a miracle is, in view of the "three days" of verse 2, to imply one of the following conditions:

(1) That the multitude as a whole arrived without sufficient food for three days and went hungry while Jesus' party had food to spare and was the last to think of sharing out.

(2) That each of the four thousand simultaneously exhausted his own stock so that the first real need was simultaneous and universal with the exception of Jesus' party.

(3) That while those who still had were refraining from sharing with those who had not, Jesus approved their self-care and made generosity unnecessary by a miracle.

We have already seen that Mark viii. 11 implies that the gathering recounted in the preceding verses was pre-arranged and not casual. And we now see that if a stupendous miracle had just been worked in the presence of four thousand people, the Pharisees' demand for a sign becomes incredible and too childish to move Jesus as it did. Mark viii. 11–13 presupposes that Mark viii. 1–10 tells of a conference at

which nothing miraculous happened, and immediately after which Jesus could say, "Why doth this generation seek a sign? Verily I say unto you, there shall no sign be given unto this generation."

And it is to be noted that although Mark, in recording a miracle, almost always records the impression made upon those present, yet neither in viii. 1–10 nor in vi. 34–44 are we told that any one saw anything miraculous in the manner of the feeding. In continuing the story vi. 51 tells that when the Twelve saw the storm calmed "they were sore amazed in themselves," and an editor, puzzled apparently that this should be said of the calming of the sea while nothing of the sort was said of the feeding of the five thousand, comments, "for they understood not concerning the loaves," implying that had they understood the feeding as he did they would have been surprised at nothing, and so suggesting very strongly that the original tradition of the feeding said nothing of the disciples' wonder simply because they saw nothing miraculous in it.

It is probable, however, that one of the sources behind the account of chapter vi. represents a tradition that had developed in the direction of regarding the event as miraculous. This appears in a passage that also confirms the presence of two sources, "And He commanded them that all should sit down by companies upon the green grass. And they sat down in ranks, by hundreds, and by fifties" (vers. 39, 40). Now ranks (*πρασιαί*, literally garden-beds) are not "companies" (*συμπόσια*, literally drinking-parties), the former suggesting precise order, the latter, friendly grouping, and the contradictory nature of this change of terms is stressed by the added particulars, "by hundreds and by fifties." These numbers can hardly mean that the crowd sat in detachments, some of a hundred and some of fifty, for there seems no reason for such an arrangement,

nor is it what we should naturally understand from the words if we translate πρασιαί as "ranks" or "rows," which, since eastern gardens grew more vegetables than flowers, is its probable meaning in this connexion. But by itself "in ranks by hundreds and by fifties" is intelligible: it means a mass formation in lines, fifty by a hundred, making exactly the five thousand of verse 44. But this is quite a different formation from "companies," and suggests a different understanding of the event. If our interpretation of the narrative of chapter viii. is correct, then the command to sit in companies was natural to Jesus' intent, preventing those who still had food from segregating themselves from those who had not, and both suggesting and facilitating a general following of the lead given them by Jesus. On the other hand, the arrangement in ranks would be the formation easiest to serve from one source, and suggests that all the multitude was without food and that they were all supplied from the five loaves and two fishes. It would thus appear that one of the sources behind chapter vi. agreed with chapter viii. in having no suggestion of the miraculous, while the other, though still omitting to record any surprise on the part of those who partook, was formed under the suggestion that the event was a miracle.

It is a confirmation of the above conclusions rather than otherwise that they compel us to take Mark viii. 17–20 as an editorial insertion. These verses are redundant beside verse 21: they suggest that Jesus was quite willing to do what in the wilderness temptation He had repudiated, i.e., to perform a miracle to supply His own needs. For unless these words mean that the disciples might rely on His miraculous power to supply the lack of bread, it is hard to see what they mean. Without them the incident becomes clear. The energetic measures of Jesus culminating in the conference on the eastern side of the lake moved the Pharisees

to demand His credentials (viii. 11). Mark iii. 6 tells of a plot between the Pharisees and Herodians to kill Jesus and this cannot have long preceded the awakening of Herod's interest (vi. 14), which is recorded between the sending out and the return of the Twelve, and cannot have taken place very long after the outburst of popularity which necessitated their appointment and the stir that their mission occasioned. So that behind the Pharisees' demand of viii. 11 lay the threat of Herod's hostility (see Luke xiii. 31).

It is interesting to consider here the statement of John vi. 15 that the multitude wanted to make Him king. This action on their part is in itself unlikely in view of their common estimate of Jesus as the Baptist or Elijah or one of the prophets (Mark vi. 14, 15; viii. 28). Under the circumstances it would have been tantamount to acknowledging Jesus as the Messiah and so to forestalling Peter's confession at Cæsarea Philippi. But the verse (John vi. 15) depicts just the interpretation which the Pharisees who were plotting against Jesus would put upon this gathering in the wilderness in order to rouse Herod to action, while the incident itself may quite easily have given them genuine suspicions that Jesus entertained claims to Messiahship and so may have moved them to demand (Mark viii. 11) a sign in proof of the claim. And if the Pharisees' demand thus at the same time threatened to invoke Herod's fatal interference and to travesty before the world the sacred secret of His Messiahship we can understand how it was that Jesus " sighed deeply in spirit " and that His departure was so hurried that the disciples forgot to take bread. Under these circumstances the meaning of Jesus' words in viii. 15 becomes clear. He bids them beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of Herod, evidently warning them against the imminent danger of allowing their opponents' method and spirit to contaminate theirs, the application of

which to the situation would be that, faced with such opposition, He could not continue to work in Galilee unless He fought His opponents with their own evil weapons, and hence the need for departure.

It thus appears from comparison of vi. 30–44 with viii. 1–10 that the Second Gospel evinces the use of three sources. The likelihood of this has its most obvious confirmation in the three predictions of the sufferings of the Son of man (viii. 31, ix. 31, x. 33, 34), which occur without reference to one another and in such terms as to suggest that each passage records the broaching of the subject. There are other indications of like significance, amongst which one of the most striking is the arrangement of chapter iv.

In that chapter verse 2 tells us that Jesus "taught them many things in parables": in vers. 3–8 one parable only is recounted. In verse 10b "the twelve asked of Him the parables": in verse 13a Jesus says, "Know ye not this parable?" and proceeds to explain the one parable recounted. It looks therefore as though vers. 2a and 10b belong to an account in which it was said that Jesus taught in parables but in which no parable was preserved, and vers. 3–8, 13–20 to another account in which the parable of the Sower was given and explained. And we notice that vers. 11, 12 imply either that the Twelve understood the parables as "those that are without" did not, or that it was Jesus' intention to give them special enlightenment, both of which cases are incompatible with His surprise, as expressed in verse 13, that they did not understand. And the whole parable of the Sower, both in its explanation of cases of unfruitfulness and its picture of abundant harvest, is incompatible with the statement of vers. 11, 12, that Jesus spoke in parables in order that His word should not bear fruit in the hearts of His hearers.

Then we note that in vers. 1–9 the multitude is with Jesus:

in vers. 10 ff. He is alone with His followers ; but vers. 35 ff. assume that the multitude has been with Him all the day. It would thus seem that beside the two sources visible in the incongruities of vers. 1–20 there was a third in which no private discourse had place. This is confirmed by verse 9, "Who hath ears to hear, let him hear," which commits the parable to the hearers' intelligence and suggests that no explanation will follow.

Additional evidence of the complexity of this chapter appears in the repetition of the substance of verse 9 in verse 23, and the even more than Marcan redundancy of vers. 1, 2, "Again He began to teach . . . and He taught . . . and said unto them in His teaching . . ."

The particular interest of chapter iv, for our present purpose lies in the source which, without any private explanation, passed straight from the parable of the Sower (followed possibly by the parables of vers. 26–32, though the terminal nature of verse 9 makes this unlikely) to the crossing of the lake (vers. 35–41). For a careful reading of the latter makes it hard to avoid the conclusion that it was a journey from the eastern to the western side. If they had spent the day on the eastern side, the necessity for returning home at night is obvious, but if they were already on the "home" side, what reason would there be for departing late at night for the opposite shore ? We are told, too, that "other boats were with Him," which can only mean that other boats were making the same journey, for it would be meaningless to tell us that there were other boats at the beach from which He started. And this again makes it the more probable that the journey was towards and not away from the "home" or western side, for even if Jesus and the Twelve had some special reason (e.g. to seek solitude) for leaving late at night for the eastern side, why should other boats accompany them ? But if the journey was home-

wards at nightfall, then all who were with Him would naturally be making the same journey. And this implies a gathering on the eastern side of the lake to which others besides Jesus and the Twelve had come by boat, i.e., an arranged gathering.

In view of these considerations it is possible that in Mark iv. 35–41 we have an account from another source of the journey differently told in vi. 45–51, and it is to be noticed that vi. 52 ignores iv. 35–41 under conditions where a reference to it would have been very much to the point, but where reference is made only to the immediately preceding story of the feeding. If this suggestion is correct, then, since the return journey after the account of viii. 1–9 follows in verse 10, the account of iv. 35–41 seems to be from the source of which fragments are inserted in the main account of the feeding in vi. 30–44, and just as we found that the main source of vi. 30–44 tended to see the miraculous while the inserted fragments approximated to viii. 1–10 in suggesting none, so we find an enhancement of the miraculous in the story of the crossing given in vi. 45–52 as compared with that of iv. 35–41.

But a point of greater interest is that, if Mark iv. 35–41 and vi. 45–51 are accounts of the same incident, we have the occasion on which Jesus spoke the parable of the Sower and find it to be one for which it has peculiar fitness. Jesus had sent the Twelve out to sow, and despite all failures here, in the gathered thousands, was the harvest. And it is possible that this parable of the multiplication of food was not without influence in forming the tradition of the occasion on which it was spoken.

A. T. Cadoux.

THE APOCALYPTIC SETTING OF THE EPISTLES TO THE THESSALONIANS.

The two words Apocalyptic and Eschatological have to be carefully distinguished the one from the other, for they have not unfrequently been confused. Each indeed has to do with "the last things" (*τὰ ἐσχάτα*), but to the apocalyptist these last things were to happen at the end of the age or dispensation, when the Messianic kingdom would be ushered in, while to eschatology these last things were to be at the end of the world, and referred to death, judgment, and the future state alike of the good and the bad. Apocalyptic, especially in its latest forms, had its own eschatology, but in its earlier and best writings it concerned itself with a vision of the new age that was to come on this earth. Apocalyptic had a splendid vision, and a great hope. It arose in evil days, and on eagle wings of living faith it surmounted all lowering clouds, and dwelt in the sunshine of the better day. The apocalyptist differed from the prophet. He believed that the present evil age was to be suddenly ended in some great catastrophe by the glorious intervention of God, while the prophet maintained the progressive revelation of God in an ever increasing unfolding, slow but gradual, of the Divine purpose. As the voice of the prophet ceased to be heard in the land that of the Apocalyptist had its opportunity.

In this way the whole atmosphere at the time of the appearance of Christ was charged with the thought and language of apocalyptic. The pious folk were influenced by it, and when Jesus used words no doubt in His case largely borrowed from the old prophetic writings, they were coloured and interpreted in the popular mind by apocalyptic imagery. While the gospel was not the product

of apocalyptic, it appeared on the soil of apocalyptic, and too often seemed to be an apocalyptic message.

To illustrate this we deal with the earliest extant Christian documents, the two letters of Paul to the church at Thessalonica. In addition to the oral tradition embodying the main facts of the life and work of Jesus, on which the Church was founded, there were doubtless several brief statements in writing of the words and deeds of the Master as the introduction of Luke's gospel would suggest. Scholars have constructed an original document called Q as one made use of by Luke and Matthew. Paul became a follower of Christ about 33 A.D., and probably had seen Jesus. As a protagonist for the Sanhedrin he doubtless was acquainted at first hand with the sayings and doings of Christ. He had begun his world-mission about 45, and had spent much time in Thessalonica. Probably he had written or sent messages to this Church before writing the extant letters. He inaugurated the New Testament Canon with these writings. In them we are brought into close touch with the earliest presentation of the Christian faith in the primitive Church. And here, if anywhere, we shall find the traces of apocalyptic in its first influence on his own mind and on that of others. We say first traces, for the mind of the apostle was continually growing, and in his last epistles the element of apocalyptic is entirely absent. In other words, apocalyptic appears in his earliest writings as a limiting and hindering factor, which was to be laid aside when he reached a fuller comprehension of the essential teaching of Jesus in its spiritual fulness.

Now we are told in striking but very simple language about the way in which Paul's preaching worked at first. It came in effective power as life from the dead, and many were " turned from idols to serve the living God, and to wait for his Son from heaven, even Jesus, whom he raised

from the dead, who delivered us from the wrath to come" (1 Thess. i. 5, 8, 9).

In these words there are two main thoughts which at first received an apocalyptic interpretation, viz., (1) The coming again of the Christ; and (2) the deliverance from the wrath to come.

We deal with the second thought first. In the early preaching of John the Baptist we find him asking the Pharisees, "Who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?" And the reference is to the terrible judgment to be executed upon all unbelievers when the Messianic kingdom was to begin. The last words of Malachi, in harmony with the teaching of Isaiah and his predecessors, declared that "the coming of the great and dreadful day of Yahweh" would be a "coming and smiting of the land with a curse," unless there were a great repentance on the part of the people. In the opening words of Isaiah the glory of the "Day of Yahweh" is dwelt upon, and in two later apocalyptic passages there is dramatic emphasis laid on "the day of vengeance" (Isa. lxi. 2, lxiii. 4). While in the book of Daniel, which is essentially an apocalyptic writing, and probably the first of the long series that followed, "the stone cut out of the mountain without hands" was to break all kingdoms, and the "kingdom of the saints" was to be set up as an everlasting kingdom. The wicked were to be destroyed out of the land, i.e., the land of Palestine. The righteous are thereby to be delivered, and in a supreme act of judgment, or vindication, God is to be glorified, and those who trusted in Him truly saved. This was "the wrath to come," and it was an objective, not a subjective wrath. It was something political and national to happen at a definite moment in Israel's history. In the song of Zacharias (Luke i. 71, 74) reference is made to this apocalyptic hope. Here a narrow Jewish particularism finds expression,

Before the coming of the Messiah King there had thus to be a terrible day. The time placing is important; without it the kingdom could not come. It is the case that in the apocalyptists there is a considerable difference of opinion as to whether the day of vengeance is to be an act of God prior to the coming of the Messiah, or an accompaniment thereof, when from His mouth there would proceed a fire that would destroy the wicked. But it is necessary for us exactly to understand what the reference to "the wrath to come" here means. It is not a final world judgment of a moral and spiritual kind, as we now view the last judgment; but it was a supreme destruction of the wicked, so that the kingdom might be set up in glory. Being delivered from wrath the young Church expected the speedy coming of the Messiah. The apostle had to remind them that the "wrath to come" had not yet been seen, and that there would be no coming of Christ until in some very open and manifest manner there should be the destruction of wickedness as a spirit and power working among men, or embodied in some person, as the Man of Lawlessness or Sin. And on the meaning of this speculation was rife. Why had he not appeared? What was the restraining influence or power? Whence or where was he or it to come? And on the supposition that this apocalyptic theorising is true, every age has had its own special explanation to give. The great apostle in his last letters has obviously given up all this vain speculation, and if the Church had only seen that it was part of the apocalyptic setting, it would have followed his example, and done so too.

But the second thought now falls to be considered. That is the Second Coming or the Parousia, which as the result of apocalyptic had such a prominent place in the early Church. Here we have to think ourselves back into the

position of the early days. The glorious coming of the Messiah was part of the apocalyptic hope. To the old expression the Christian element is added, "His Son." The original expectation was that the Messiah should appear "in power and glory" as on the clouds, along with the saints or angels. This was to be a time event and of local character, as forecasted in the words of the prophet Zechariah (chap. xiv. 4). "His feet shall stand in that day upon the mount of Olives." This was not in any sense thought of as a spiritual experience; it was to be wholly sensible and external, something spectacular from which some splendid results would immediately follow. The value of the coming was in this way emphasised as a bringing about of blessings not otherwise obtained or to be obtained. It was to be the bringing in of the kingdom with all its ancient glories, the earthly kingdom of the house of David. So that when Christ began to proclaim a kingdom of God, in which bliss was alone to be found, as near at hand, which by the reaching forth of the hand and taking might be the real spiritual possession of all, the people thought of an outward kingdom, near in time. Thus the mother of John and James construed it, and probably all the disciples, as they regarded it as like other kingdoms with seats of honour for the favourites, and rewards for all. The story of the conversation on the way to Emmaus tells us how the two travellers naïvely expressed the current expectation that they were disappointed because Jesus had in no open way delivered Israel. (Luke xxiv. 21.) While also we have the anxious question in Acts i. 6, "Wilt thou at this time restore the kingdom to Israel?" The kingdom as expected had not come. The first coming of the Messiah had not accomplished the commonly desired effects, and therefore a second coming was looked for. This meant the failure to understand the worth of the

first coming, of a Saviour who had come, and the "artificially constructed theory of a twofold advent!" The work of the Messiah was divided into two, part being done in His first coming, and the other part in the second advent, for which the Church had to wait. In the first was suffering; in the second, glory. (Heb. ix. 28.) It was not then understood as it was when the fourth gospel was written that suffering was glory. (John. xii. 23.)

The reference in 1 Thessalonians ii. 12 to the "kingdom and the glory" is to that of the second coming, when, as in 2 Thessalonians i. 5–10, "He shall come to be glorified in his saints."

For the bringing in of such a kingdom many in Israel were prepared to take up the sword. They were the Zealots, and one of the apostolic band belonged to them. They would take the kingdom by force, as Mahomet in his time did. When Christ spoke about the kingdom His words were thus misunderstood, and wholly misrepresented. Not His thought about a kingdom which was to be in men, growing like seed, and working like leaven, was received by His reporters; but the current idea as to the kingdom was promulgated by them and regarded then, as by many since, as His. In the fourth gospel the failure of the disciples to understand Jesus is often stated. That understanding was only their glad possession when, after the glorifying of Jesus, the Spirit was given. (John vi. 37). For the definite forms of expression His reporters, and not Himself, are responsible. So long as we forget the apocalyptic influences all around Him we cannot do justice to His mind or teaching, and our difficulties will be endless. We have to eliminate apocalyptic from the gospels, written as they were after Paul's letters, if we would understand the Master; and like Paul himself, and more especially like the writer of the fourth gospel, adequately appreciate what the Master has to say to us.

Jesus came in the true line of prophecy, basing His teaching much rather on the prophetic books of the Old Testament as the revealed will of God, than on the "backwater of Jewish literature," to quote Montefiore's description of apocalyptic. And he knew that the kingdom which the best prophets longed for was spiritual and not outward, universal and not national,—an inner vital experience as men surrendered themselves in thought and action to the rule and sovereignty of God. And Paul saw what that meant further on, when he clearly taught that the kingdom "was righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Spirit" (Rom. xiv. 17). And lest any imperfect features of an earthly kingdom might cleave to and thereby limit the true relationship of God the Father to His children, the very category of the kingdom is abandoned, and life eternal used instead, in the last great "spiritual gospel," as Clement truly called it. The category of the kingdom has been largely emphasised in modern days, but it is wholly inadequate to set forth the essential idea of Christianity. It is indeed only one form of government, and the thought of God as King rather than as Father fails to do justice to the way in which Christ ever represented and revealed God. A more satisfactory category under which to set forth the community of believers or the Communion of Saints would be the Brotherhood, or Family of God. It is of course true that in the Synoptics the idea of kingdom is common, but when Christ used this word He filled it with a fuller, richer meaning, and lit it up with the light of His own deep experience. A recent writer of much eminence in New Testament studies argues that kingdom "in its essence is fundamental to all religion," and in consequence he objects to its being discarded. We would rejoice if some word more in harmony with the thought of Christ Himself were used.

As long as the emphasis was laid on the kingdom idea, soon to be realised in a Second Coming, endless difficulties emerged in the young Church. There was in apocalyptic the hope that blessedness particularly belonged to those who should be alive when the kingdom came. To share in it would be joy indeed. Hence to die before its coming would be matter of highest grief. As the hope of the coming of the kingdom gathered round its immediate happening, even in the lifetime of those then living, as we find in an apocalyptic interpretation of Christ's words (Mark ix 1), sorrow filled the Church when some passed away. Hence the apostle writes urging them to " sorrow not even as others who have no hope " like theirs (1 Thess. iv. 13). For this was his conviction then that those " who are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not be before them who are asleep." Together those who have pased away and those who are alive shall meet their Lord in His glorious appearing. This difficulty had confronted the apocalyptists. Thus in Daniel we are told that those " who sleep in the dust shall awake " to share in the glory of the coming kingdom which is to be set up on earth (xii. 2). In the apocalyptic " Assumption of Moses " the dead were viewed as sleeping in the Messiah, and so coming with Him. In Baruch the dead are not to be deprived through death of sharing in the glory. Here we see how apocalyptic influences Paul's earlier way of thinking. The coming in the air, on the clouds, is of course apocalyptic imagery. So also is that of the shout and the sound of the trumpet, which are represented as accompaniments of the appearing.

In the Old Testament death is regarded as a sleep, and it was looked upon with dread because the moment of dying would be the cessation of that communion with God in which the Old Testament saint found his highest joy.

Life and immortality had not yet been brought to light through the gospel of Him who said that God was not the God of the dead, but of the living, and who bade men find the continuance of communion with God in the true life,—the life that could not end. The fuller meaning of death as a passing, not into a grave or any intermediate state, but to be with Christ is more and more grasped by Paul, and finally finds expression in his last letter to his much loved friends at Philippi. The thought of death as a sleep is given up, and "the souls of believers do at their death immediately pass into glory," as the catechism declares. The apostle thought much on resurrection and all that it meant and implied. We see how his mind advanced to ever clearer ideas on this supreme subject. In 1 Corinthians xv. he tells us of a spiritual body, a fit instrument for the redeemed person, while in 2 Corinthians v. 1 f. he assures us that "we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, with which we shall be clothed upon." Of this high destiny the earnest or promise is already given. But in those early days there were many limitations and colourings introduced by current ideas of time and space, which the modern mind has given up. More spiritual conceptions, such as are taught in the fourth gospel, and towards which Paul was quickly travelling, have now entered into the consciousness of the Church, and have come to stay. When the fourth gospel was written, the Church had come to see that the heaven of the believer, the Father's House, was not a place, but a state of continuous and ever growing fellowship with God in fulness of service. Hence Christ could say, "He that believeth in me shall never die." Death ceases not only to be the king of terrors, but to be at all. And thus men are delivered from that fear of death "through which they were all their lifetime in bondage." (Heb. ii. 15.)

In the second letter the apostle had to give many warnings against hasty or rash inferences based upon anything that he had said or written. He would have them "not soon shaken in mind or be troubled, neither by spirit, nor by word, nor by letter as if from us, as that the Day of the Lord is at hand." As to its certainty he has at this time no doubt. He had not yet emancipated himself from the hurtful influence of apocalyptic, with its earthly and unspiritual conceptions of the truth. The words of Christ in the fourth gospel about His speedy coming, and entering into every loving heart that kept His commandments, show how a truer conception of what Christ meant by His coming was being reached. That coming, at first conceived in terms of apocalyptic with its limiting ideas as to time and outward things, is now being thought of in a more spiritual and vital way. God's thoughts are always other and better than ours, and long time and much guidance by the Holy Spirit are required before they can be understood. In the great Trinitarian formula, added to the gospel of Matthew, the truth of the Christ who has come and who abides is enshrined, "Lo! I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." The death of Christ had been for the time the collapse of faith on the part of the disciples, and it was only when they allowed themselves to be impressed by His Personality and abiding influence that they came to realise the meaning of what He had taught. He indeed came to them and revealed Himself to them so that all their previous misunderstandings passed away. This, however, was not the work of forty days or forty years. The synoptic gospels written after Paul's death still dwelt on the outward and spectacular appearing. But scoffers arose, as St. Peter tells us, and the time element was turned down. "One day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one

day." Time here does not matter. It is the spiritual reality that counts.

Emphasis had been laid on the thought that the Messiah had to appear "in flaming fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God," and in the added Christian thought, "on them that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, who shall be punished with everlasting destruction at the presence of the Lord, and the glory of his power." (2 Thess. i. 8.) But the association of vengeance, punishment, destruction comes to be put further away from the work of God, as vengeance belongeth unto God, and a great world-wide campaign in which forgiveness and full salvation would be offered to men was thought of. Before the final consummation there was to be a glorious forth-putting of Divine power to bring men to God that they might be saved.

The connexion of the legal spirit with the conception of God has done much harm. It arose naturally under apocalyptic when men placed importance on possession and privilege, and ignored service and responsibility. Then it was easy to think of God appearing to punish the enemies of a supposed holy people. When, however, the truer thought of God as waiting to be gracious, of Christ as a Saviour seeking to save the lost, became dominant, grace rather than law was seen to be the very nature of God. He was declared to be love. And it is interesting to note that in Isaiah it was a day of vengeance, and a year of acceptance. When St. Luke makes Christ quote the words from this prophet he omits altogether the reference to the day of vengeance. Here there is evidence of the way in which, in this third and last of the Synoptics, there is a surmounting of apocalyptic, and a distinct toning down of apocalyptic sayings in Mark and Matthew. There was a tendency soon manifest to associate words of Christ

with the destruction of Jerusalem, and to see in this event the day of vengeance. Hence the verse in 1 Thessalonians ii. 16, with the words "The wrath is come upon them to the uttermost," is regarded as a later comment on the apostle's own writing, added when some then (and many since) have found in a wholly arbitrary way a distinct and definite fulfilment of a prophetic word. This is but one illustration of the way in which apocalyptic influenced men's minds, leading them as it did to attach an apocalyptic significance to certain events. In this way harm has been done to "the sure word of prophecy" and to much of the teaching of Jesus by the superimposing upon it of man-made inferences. Every fact and event has its own historical meaning and interpretation in itself. It may illustrate generally the principles of the government of the world by God; but no one has any right to dogmatise about it as the fulfilment of a particular prophetic word. If Rome was the restraining influence in Paul's time, and if as a loyal citizen of her Empire he made his boast of her justice, so that with confidence he carried his appeal to Cæsar, his later experiences in the imperial city were sadly to disillusionise him, so that he found in Rome, as the writer of the Book of Revelation, another apocalyptist, afterwards did, the real enemy of the Church of Jesus.

The fundamental error of the apocalyptic attitude to life was the way in which all importance was placed upon the future, and the worth of the living present, with all its heritage of blessing, was in consequence depreciated. The apocalyptist has doubtless his own value in times of despair in bidding men be of good cheer and lift up their hearts, as he gave them comfort by glowing views of a better day to come. And yet he might, and did do harm by ignoring present possibilties and supreme responsibilities, which men of God were being called upon to realise in some urgent

manner. Cloud-gazing hinders the farmer from ploughing, and the Christian from walking worthily of his high calling to work to-day in the vineyard. In the later apocalyptic writings there had been a despair of the earth as a fit or possible arena for the new kingdom of God to which their ardent hopes were directed. The new order required not only a cleansed earth, but a new earth altogether. Hope for the world was abandoned, and all bliss was looked for in a heaven beyond the skies. Thus religion became unduly otherworldly. This danger Paul had to warn his converts against. He bade them stand fast, do their work with quietness, and be not weary in well doing. His anxiety was that their hearts should be directed into the "love of God," not into any waiting for Christ, but into the patience which Christ showed, and which should have its perfect work in all His followers. (2 Thess. iii. 5.) And he told them that "the mystery of iniquity was already at work (ii. 7). His was no interim-ethic, but with growing clearness and deeper urgency a call to higher service, addressed to those who were the children of light, who should do the works of the day, putting on the breastplate of faith and love. (1 Thess v. 8.) Only in this way can the will of God be done on earth as in heaven, and His kingdom, that new rule of God which is to fill the world with light and joy, fully come. The "worth of the apocalyptic was the passing, that of the non-apocalyptic is the abiding."

And the fault is found not only of depreciating the "life that now is" but of depreciating the worth of the Saviour who has already come, and of looking for another. In His time many were looking for outward signs, and some even came to Himself, the best of all signs, to ask from Him a sign, while they were all irresponsive to His own appeal. To such persons no other sign could be given than what they already had. They had Moses and the prophets, and now

they had Him. The fourth gospel emphasises the point that failure to use these would only attend the gift of more. While to the later experience of Paul, and this gospel, salvation was to be a living fellowship with God through Jesus Christ, and the apostle gloried in saying, "To me to live is Christ," and could count all things but loss for the excellency of Christ Jesus" his Lord (Phil. i. 21, iii. 8), he was surrounded by those who associated all their blessing with some future event, some second coming. Thus in his later epistles Paul had to lay the stress on the new life with its new order and principle, and not on the new age and a coming kingdom. The worth of the historical Jesus was not adequately realised, and we may be glad that "we possess the Idea and the Person with the minimum of historical and contemporary limitations." Even these we may drop, making no "daring re-interpretation of Jesus," as is by some attributed to the fourth Gospel, but finding there the very truth about the Master press close to His side. It has been truly said that the Judaising forms of "primitive Christianity have perished that the Gospel might be preserved." "While Jesus was not what men expected to find in the Christ or Messiah," He was something a great deal better," and the Church can take her stand on the redemption accomplished by Him, rejecting all the draperies in which He has been clothed, and by which His glory has been veiled, that so men to-day may see Jesus and come under His power as did Paul himself. It was difficult even for him to free himself from the entangling apocalyptic by which his atmosphere was charged, but he at length entered into the freedom whereunto Christ had made him free. This task in a large measure still lies before the Church to-day, and what Paul did for his time may, by the same vision which he had of Jesus, be accomplished for us now who see the glory that is in Him. BUCHANAN BLAKE.

NOTES AND NOTICES OF RECENT CRITICISM.

A CLOSING WORD.

Jesus finishes His address to the disciples, the so-called "Sermon on the Mount," with a warning. He had just been speaking about the futility of listening to his words and doing no more. *It is not everyone who says to me "Lord, Lord!" who will get into the Realm of Heaven, but he who does the will of my Father in heaven* (Matt. vii. 21). The will of the Father is expressed in the words of Jesus. And to *say to Him "Lord"* (*ὁ λέγων μοι Κύριε*) is not to appeal to Him for help; it is to acknowledge Him as *Κύριος*. Now this acknowledgement must be more than mere lip-service. A *κύριος* has *δούλοι* or servants. Jesus is Lord of the Father's household, and membership in that household means obedience to His orders as a revelation of the Father's will. Hence the closing appeal (verses 24–27): listen to My words and act upon them, for this is the only stable basis for life. Jesus had been a builder by trade. He speaks from experience. Now, the fundamental feature in ancient architecture was safety. In an article on the excavations at Babylon, published in the *Burlington Magazine* (1915, p. 249), Mr. L. W. King pointed out that "one important point to realise is that the builders of all periods were on the defensive, and not solely against human foes. . . . The foe they most dreaded was flood. Security against flood conditioned the architect's ideal." The simile of Jesus is drawn in similar colours. A man who hears and carries out His teaching is compared to a builder who founded his house on firm rock. *The rain came down, the floods rose* (*ποταμοί*, the streams in flood), *the winds blew and beat upon that house, but it did not fall, for it was founded on rock.* The storm of wind and rain that tests an edifice is probably hardship and persecution. The Christian must lay his account with rough weather in this world. Nothing will hold out except a character which is based on obedience, which has made the truths and laws of the Lord its own. The superficial life, which makes no effort to work these into the will and mind, collapses under the strain. Jesus knew how people were often delighted to listen to Him, without making any effort to apply what He

said to their own lives. They did not make His truths the motives of their life. They might be charmed to hear Him denounce errors, which they instinctively looked out for in their neighbours. Poor folk applauded His words against the wealthy. Pharisees were delighted when He denounced Sadducees. And so on. They might admire His fine language and noble ideas about God and man, admiring them with detached minds. But this was not personal religion. Jesus sometimes found it hard to get people to listen to Him attentively. But He knew that even attentive listening must be followed up, and He could not take this for granted. So the address which began with beatitudes ends with a warning. The hearers went away with the sound of the crash in their ears : *ἦν ἡ πτῶσις αὐτῆς μεγάλη.* The warning was repeated later in His Galilean mission. It is the thought of the superficial hearers' fate in the parable of the Sower (Matt. xiii. 5, 6, 20, 21).

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

(*a*) " . . . My reason for writing is to ask if the translation of Ezekiel i. 10, ' on the right the face of an eagle,' is a case of Homer nodding. Excuse the suggestion ; but if I am wrong, could you give me your authorities for giving the kherubs two eagle's faces." (J. O. U., Liverpool.)

I apologise ; " eagle " is, of course, a slip for " lion." You might kindly correct two other obvious slips in volume i. of the translation ; read " four " for " five " in Genesis xiv. 11, and " Isaac " for " Jacob " in Genesis xxvii. 27.

(*b*) " May I send you my special thanks for your version of the book of Job ? I am a Jew, and some of my fellow religionists on this side desire to convey to you, as I myself do, our gratitude for what we consider a vivid and faithful transcript. . . . Our only perplexity is caused by your occasional use of rhyme. Had you any principle in employing this un-Semitic form ? " (A. H., New York.)

Many thanks for your letter. A translator ought not perhaps to criticise his own work, and yet he can generally take as objective a view of it as other people. So that I may say frankly that I agree with your verdict on the book of Job in my translation ; you will not misunderstand me if I claim that it is not

one of the least successful pieces of the work. As to rhyme, I can honestly declare that I neither sought it nor avoided it. Sometimes, in crooning over a verse in Hebrew, rhyme came; and then I had as little hesitation as a rule in accepting it as modern classical scholars have in rendering the choruses of the Greek dramatists. We often need something to convey to modern readers the musical rhythm of an ancient classic; the English literary form of rhyme is, I hold, a legitimate medium for this. Thus, in a lyric like the forty-ninth psalm, the chiming effect of the couplet in verses 12 and 20 cannot be reproduced except by means of rhyme for a modern ear:

> For all the splendour that they cherish,
> men pass, even as the beasts that perish.

Similarly, in the twenty-eighth chapter of Job, with the recurring refrain:

> Where is wisdom to be found?
> And knowledge, where does it abound?

(*c*) "I have no knowledge of the Hebrew language, but this may justify me in venturing to tell you that you have made the prophets intelligible to me for the first time; I now see that their writings are literature. You will not consider it an impertinence, I trust, if I remark that your poetical renderings of the prophets in the Old Testament translation will prove as valuable as your rendering of the epistles of St. Paul in the New Testament translation. . . . And, in conclusion, will you please explain to me why, in Psalm xviii. 2, you translate 'my God, my fortalice'?" (M. C. T., Edinburgh.)

I wanted a word here that was both poetical and archaic, for it is a primitive lyric; also I needed a word that had become domiciled in ordinary speech. So I chose "fortalice," which answers all three requirements. Whether some translator has used it already or not, I do not remember; but it is not an unfamiliar term nowadays. One proof of a word's popularity is its entrance into the lighter prose of the period. And "fortalice" fairly meets this test, as an equivalent for "fortress." Let me cite one reference. In *Some Irish Yesterdays*, by E. Oe. Somerville and Martin Ross, these clever ladies, describing a picnic, tell how they once entered an Irish cottage where "a small but determined mother goat dared us to force the fortalice

of the inner chamber in which her offspring were, no doubt, in laager."

(*d*) "Could you possibly find space to give me some fresh notes upon the interview between the rich young ruler and our Lord? The commentaries which I have consulted do not clear up the exact meaning; but perhaps this is my own fault, not theirs." (A. M., London.)

On this incident (Mark x. 17–31 = Matthew xix. 16–30, Luke xviii. 18–30) I should note first: (*a*) What the man wanted was to obtain "a footing in the new Age" (Burkitt, *Zeitschrift für die Neutest. Wissenschaft*, 1911, p. 230). This is the meaning of his application, *τί ἀγαθὸν ποιήσω ἵνα σχῶ ζωὴν αἰώνιον*; Mark's *κληρονομήσω* is merely an equivalent for *σχῶ* in the sense of "obtain." Eternal life here as elsewhere is the new order of the Realm or Reign of God. Thus, when the perplexed disciples afterwards ask, *τίς ἄρα δύναται σωθῆναι*; it is plain that to be "saved" is to enter life eternal or the Realm, as in 4 Macc. xv. 3, *τὴν εὐσέβειαν . . . τὴν σώζουσαν εἰς αἰώνιον ζωήν*. (*b*) Contrast the honest claim of the man (*ταῦτα πάντα ἐφυλαξάμην ἐκ νεότητός μου*) with the admission of Marcus Aurelius (viii. 1): *καὶ τοῦτο πρὸς τὸ ἀκενόδοξον φέρει, ὅτι οὐκέτι δύνασαι* (you cannot possibly claim) *τὸν βίον ὅλον ἢ τόν γε ἀπὸ νεότητος φιλόσοφον βεβιωκέναι*. (*c*) "If you want to be whole-hearted (*τέλειος* with life all of a piece, really 'rich,' and blissful), sell all your possessions, give them to poor folk, and you shall have treasure in heaven." Compare Dostoieffsky's words in *A Raw Youth* (p. 382): "Though money be not their God, yet it is a demi-god—a great temptation. . . . Take a grain of sand and sow it on a stone; when that yellow grain of sand of yours springs up, then your dream will come true in the world. That's a saying of ours. Very different from Christ's 'Go and give all thou hast to the poor and become the servant of all.' Then thou wilt be a thousandfold richer than ever before; for not by bread alone, not by rich garments, not by pride, not by envy, wilt thou be happy, but by love multiplied immeasurably." (*d*) Dr. E. A. Abbott, in *The Fourfold Gospel* (131 f.), thinks that the man was offering a bribe of money to Jesus, offering to give Him a sum for the poor, "in order to secure from Him a verdict that would ratify the man's good opinion of himself," and that Jesus applied this severe test to him, knowing beforehand that he would fail.

But this is too harsh an interpretation. Jesus "loved" the man for his enthusiasm and high moral character. He was hopeful that the special test might be passed. When the man failed, Jesus warned the disciples that no one could rise to the supreme sacrifices of his vocation apart from God's help. "Anything is possible for God." To enter eternal life requires a struggle with natural inclinations, which in turn requires God's grace if one is to overcome the instinctive clinging to what is lower. If salvation is so extremely hard, the disciples ask in dismay, who then can be saved? Jesus replied, "For men it is impossible (i.e. salvation), but not for God; anything is possible for God." Men unaided cannot break through their prejudices and hampering associations; but God can enable them to do so. "Cette parole très authentique de Jésus," as Lagrange points out, "contient en germe la doctrine de Paul," i.e. of grace.

REVIEWS.

Code Hittite, provenant de l'Asie Mineure (vers. 1350 av. J. C.). Edited and translated by Frédéric Hrozny. Part I. (with 26 Plates), pp. 159. Paris, 1922. 45 fr.

The cuneiform text of this code was found at Boghaz keui by Hugo Winckler, and was published in 1921 by F. Hrozny. Although the language is Hittite, two independent translations appeared in 1922, one by Heinrich Zimmern, the other, with facsimiles and a transcription of the text, by Hrozny himself. The translators admit that much of their work is uncertain, but the remarkable agreement between the two translations inspires confidence in both. It seems that very often the meaning of the cuneiform signs is known from their use in Sumerian and Akkadian, even when the Hittite vocables are as yet unknown.

This is the third great Oriental code which may now be used to illumine the Hebrew codes of the Old Testament. It is assigned to the fourteenth century B.C., is superior in extent and interest to the Assyrian code published in 1920 (? fifteenth century), and rivals in importance the older code of Khammurabi (1955–1913 B.C.).

A rough division of the laws of the code, in the order of their

treatment, may be given under twelve heads : Laws relating to— (1) murder and manslaughter ; (2) injuries to persons ; (3) slaves ; (4) marriage ; (5) ownership of property ; (6) taxation ; (7) theft of animals and injury done to animals ; (8) theft of, or injury to, the contents of houses, gardens, etc. ; (9) wages and the hire of animals and implements ; (10) the cultivation of the ground, including the obligation of certain sacrifices ; (11) the standard prices of cattle, horses, sheep, goats, oil, honey, dress, meat, skins, etc. ; (12) adultery, sodomy, permissible and forbidden marriages, etc.

A few illustrations of the contrasts and resemblances between this code and the Old Testament will suffice to show its value for students of the Old Testament. Murder and manslaughter are punished by applications of the principle of restitution (fourfold or twofold). The death penalty is seldom prescribed. It is, however, the punishment for contempt of judicial authority, for adultery and sodomy (with animals), and apparently for some kind of magical practice. In the Old Testament and in the code of Khammurabi, sorcery is punishable by death. Wounding and mutilation (of ears, hands, teeth, etc.) are punished by fines of varying amount. There is no application of the *lex talionis*. In the code of Khammurabi, sufferers of higher rank are given the satisfaction of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth, those of inferior rank receive compensation in money. The Hittite code requires the theft of animals to be compensated for by fifteen or ten, or seven or six fold restitution (cf. Exod. xxii. 1). Injury done to animals and thefts of some kinds of property are atoned for by money payments. A slave pays less than a free man. Wages and hires are sometimes paid in kind.

Every self-respecting theological college should add this book to its library, and every reader of it will eagerly await the appearance of Part II., which will supply a detailed commentary and glossary. WILLIAM B. STEVENSON.

* * * * *

(1) *Šumer et Akkad :* contribution à l'histoire de la civilisation dans la Basse-Mésopotamie. By Charles-F. Jean. Pp. 165 (with 92 plates). Paris, 1923.

(2) *La Glyptique Syro-Hittite.* By G. Contenau. Pp. xii., 217 (with 48 plates). Paris, 1922. 40 fr.

(1) This work is primarily an edition of 224 hitherto un-

published tablets, of which 176 belong to the twenty-fourth century, and the remainder to the twenty-second and twenty-first centuries B.C. Copies are given of the originals and translations arranged according to subject matter and place of origin. The language of most of the documents is Sumerian and they seldom extend to more than a few lines. Many are official receipts or registers, sometimes with the seals of officials or of the king attached. They record payments of wages and deliveries of animals or of produce to the royal household or to temples. Some are legal documents, relating to sales, division of property, etc. There are a few letters.

A very large number of proper names occur in the texts and the editor makes a special study of these in his introduction. As in the Old Testament they generally contain a divine name and express a religious sentiment or a relationship between the deity and the bearer of the name. M. Jean remarks that the deities in question and the religious ideas expressed by the names are just those of later times, now shown to belong also to the early period of these tablets.

The introduction also collects and discusses the names of the metals and the precious stones mentioned in the documents, and the objects into which they are manufactured. Bronze was then a compound of copper and lead and some other minor elements and was less used than copper itself. Silver was employed especially to make payments and in the shape of rings. Gold was used to some extent in jewellery.

Many other subjects receive elucidation from the texts. Wages are generally paid in kind, even to scribes. The numerous dates are generally given by reference to the king's reign, although several documents from Larsa are dated by reference to the year of the capture of Isin. The months are referred to either by name or by number. The day is seldom mentioned. At least two months have thirty days each (pp. 137 and 146), and perhaps No. 184 implies that all months have thirty days. An intercalary month is mentioned, perhaps the eleventh in that year (p. 91, No. 33).

It may be noted that the recently published ostraka of the ninth century from Samaria are substantially of the same character as the receipts and registers here published. The name that describes the occupation of the prophet Amos (Amos

i. 1) occurs in these texts (*nakid*), and is translated shepherd. Perhaps the women who "wove hangings for the Asherah" (2 Kings xxiii. 7) are paralleled by the nine *tisseuses* whose names are compounds in which the name of the goddess Ishtar, or an equivalent of it, occurs (p. 135).

(2) This is the second volume of a promising new series published under the auspices of the *Service des antiquités et des beaux-arts* of the French Republic in Syria. It treats of a group of ordinary and cylinder seals whose country of origin is the eastern part of Asia Minor and the north part of Syria. Two principal periods of production are distinguished: (1) 2400–1550 B.C.; (2) 1550–1100 B.C. In the former the seals have a close relation to Sumero-Akkadian and later Mesopotamian art. Among the prominent themes are deities riding in chariots and representations of bull worship. In the latter there are clear traces of Egyptian and Cyprian influence, although many distinctive native motives are also found, such as a deity who carries an axe in his hand and another who carries a curved staff. The naked goddess Ishtar is also prominent. From the eleventh to the sixth century the distinctive art of these seals degenerates and disappears under the influence of Assyrian models.

Independently of the letterpress, the plates of this volume are valuable and reward inspection. The frequency of the representation of a crescent moon, joined with a star or the solar disk, is noteworthy. In the solar disk there is often a cross, like a St. George's cross. Representations of a double eagle occur, as well as simple figures of eagles.

M. Contenau alludes to the magical value and significance of the symbols of these seals (p. 34), but does not name or discuss those which may be regarded as magic signs in a special sense. There are, however, at least some occurrences of what may be regarded as early examples of the well-known and widely used magic signs of later periods, such as hands (Figs. 129, 186, 286, and perhaps 130) and ladders (Figs. 213 and 297).

WILLIAM B. STEVENSON.

* * * * *

The Old Testament: a New Translation. By James Moffatt, D.D., D.Litt., M.A. Hodder and Stoughton. Vol. II. Job to Malachi, pp. xii. + 483. 10*s.* 6*d.*

Translators alone know how difficult translation is. To the

unpractised it may seem an easy thing for a man, armed with grammar and dictionary, to take a passage or a book in a foreign language and render each word into a word in his own vernacular. But this method would supply nothing more than a schoolboy "construe"; it would not yield a real translation. It would fail to reproduce some of the most important elements in the original, elements which are not easy either to appreciate or to render in terms of another age and another people. Even words themselves are often nearly untranslatable; he who can infallibly give the right English equivalent of the Latin *res*, the Greek *καλός*, or the Hebrew מִשְׁפָּט, has a knowledge of the language with which he is dealing which places him above all criticism. And when we add the difficulties presented by idiom and style, we realize that a perfect translation is a thing which has never yet been attained and possibly never will be. The translator needs to think fluently in both the languages with which he is dealing, and to transfer not mere words but that indefinable content of meaning which surrounds them from one speech to the other.

A translation must aim in the first place at giving the essential thought of the original. If it fails there its other qualities are little more than wreaths upon a coffin. But this in itself is not enough; a paraphrase is not a translation. The book in the new language should be good literature; it should not repel its readers. Every word in the original should be represented in the translation, if possible by a single word, and every word in the translation should represent a word or phrase in the original. There should be no omissions and no superfluities. Differences in style should be marked; this is particularly necessary in such a literature as that of the Old Testament, which covers a period of roughly a thousand years and includes many forms of writing, some good and (it had better be confessed frankly) some bad. For it is on the style of a piece of writing that the reader depends for the emotional atmosphere which is an essential part of the effect, and no real student of the Biblical languages can read the Greek of the Apocalypse or the Hebrew of Chronicles with satisfaction and comfort.

No literature has been more fortunate in its translators than the Bible. The English Authorised Version is not the only one which takes the highest place in a national literature; the same

claim may certainly be made for the older Syriac versions of the New Testament and probably for the German version. Each stands near the beginning of a great literature, and each has set a standard which later writers have seldom attained and never surpassed. Yet even the English Authorised Version is open to criticism. Semitic philology was still somewhat rudimentary in the seventeenth century, and in particular the translators lived before that age of poetic research which was inaugurated by Lowth. The uniformity of the style, whilst undoubtedly a very great asset from the point of view of English literature, obscures the wide variations in the original—no one, for instance, would guess from reading the A.V. of Genesis i. and ii. that the two chapters are separated by divergences in style as wide at least as those which distinguish Swift from Bunyan. Textual criticism had hardly begun, and the Hebrew which the translators of King James used was unfortunately full of errors, many of them easily remediable by reference to the older Versions (particularly the LXX), many of them, unfortunately, corrupt beyond hope of certain correction. Most serious of all, the very familiarity which we are all supposed to have with the language of the A.V. tends to hypnotise each succeeding generation. It is imperative that we should from time to time " depolarise our language " (to borrow a phrase from Oliver Wendell Holmes), and so get a fair view of what the words really mean.

In these two respects Dr. Moffatt's work is an extremely important advance on the traditional English versions. It is based on sound textual principles, and whilst there are, no doubt, many passages in which no one can claim a final text, there are many others in which Dr. Moffatt has restored what was certainly an original reading. He has even had the truthfulness and courage to leave blanks where the text is so corrupt as to be virtually meaningless and no satisfactory reading has been found. He has, too, succeeded in chasing away the glamour of the familiar but archaic phraseology. Many people will not like this, and the translator will be charged with having unnecessarily " altered " the A.V. Such a criticism is based on a complete misunderstanding of the purpose Dr. Moffatt has in view. The only possible method for him was to forget—if he could—the A.V. altogether and to start his work *de novo*. Otherwise he would have produced a mere Revised Version,

which might have been useful for some purposes, but not for those at which a genuine modern translation aims. The style is skilfully varied, and some of the "cruder" effects are, as a matter of fact, singularly happy. Samson's

> "With the jawbone of an ass have I piled them in a mass
> With the jawbone of an ass I have assailed assailants!"

will sound in some ears like punning doggerel. But what else should we expect from Samson? And what else do we find in the Hebrew text? It is, of course, true that a modern style—as an illustration we may cite the use of "you" for the singular pronoun when human beings are addressed—entirely destroys that sense of apartness, of separation from the affairs of ordinary life, which is so great a charm to many readers. But others of us feel that this of all books should be brought within the sphere of our ordinary, every-day life, and adapted to all our occupations and our needs. And after all, people who have an undefined sense that the Bible should be kept unsullied from the world need not read Dr. Moffatt.

In other respects, too, it must be admitted that the new translation has achieved a real measure of success. It certainly gives us the meaning and the thought of the original better than any of its predecessors. Actual mistakes have been corrected. Joseph's coat is no longer "of many colours," but (as it really was) "a tunic with long sleeves." Agag does not walk "delicately" to his death (how that phrase puzzled some of us till we learned Hebrew!), but "with tottering steps." And in large sections of the volume the style itself renders the thought intelligible, and gives it a new significance. This is perhaps more noticeable in the Law than elsewhere, and some students will find this part of the Old Testament even interesting. The narrative portions gain greatly in freedom, and run naturally and directly. This is partly due to the fact that Dr. Moffatt has analysed passages which he finds composite, and has given each element continuously. But it is unobtrusively done, and the diacritic signs (italics for J and square brackets for E) do not seriously interfere with the reading of the text, while the arrangement adds greatly to the clearness of each narrative. It remains to add that Dr. Moffatt has been careful to put nothing in and to leave nothing out, except where textual emendations make such changes inevitable.

In the poetical portions, which are mainly in the second volume, Dr. Moffatt has been careful to preserve the arrangement of the Hebrew lines. In some of the books this had been done already by the Revisers of 1882, but the new translation has greatly extended the principle, and usually with justification, especially in the Prophets. No attempt is made (as, for instance, by Dr. McFadyen) to reproduce the Hebrew rhythm. The renderings are rhythmical, it is true, but not on the Hebrew model, and occasionally Dr. Moffatt admits a rhyme. This will appear to many readers a weakness, and it might have been better either to avoid rhymes altogether or to allow them to run all through any poem in which they are used. An illustration may be taken from Psalm lxvi. 18–20 :—

> "Had I been thinking secretly of sin,
> the Lord would never have listened;
> but God has listened indeed,
> and to my prayer he has paid heed.
> Blessed be God who has not checked
> my prayer to him, nor his own love to me."

The Hebrew student will probably feel that the Book of Job is the least successful part of the work (this is hardly surprising !), but on the other hand the translation of the Song of Solomon is delightful. The Prophets, too, in many places, reach a high level of beauty and dignity, though it must be admitted that on the whole Dr. Moffatt has been more successful with prose than with poetry.

It is inevitable that there should be a good deal in such a work as this which may arouse hostile comment from one quarter or another. But when all allowance is made for this, the fact remains that Dr. Moffatt has given us a couple of volumes whose importance it is difficult to overestimate, and it may well be that they will take the same place in the study of the Old Testament that the same translator's work on the New Testament has already done. T. H. Robinson.

TWO BOOKS UPON JESUS.

The veteran French scholar, Dr. Charles Piepenbring, has published an enlarged edition of his *Jésus Historique* which is now translated into English under the title of *The Historical Jesus* (London : Allen and Unwin [Price 7*s*. 6*d*.]), an able

treatise on lines familiar to those who know the methods of Liberal Protestantism. Dr. Piepenbring recognises that the extant data of the gospels render it almost impossible to reconstruct what moderns would call a "biography" of Jesus, but he believes that the essential features of the gospel are visible. "Jesus' tenets are founded on principles so simple and original that they survive all later additions and transformations." He sets himself, therefore, to explain the original life and teaching of Jesus, and then, in the eighth chapter, to show how Christianity thus conceived is superior to other religions. This is a method which the passing fashion of our theological day is apt to deride. But much depends on its application. Dr. Piepenbring does not believe, for example, that Jesus instituted the eucharist as it is described in the gospels. "It is altogether unlikely that our Lord wished to establish a special communion between Himself and His disciples thereby. Far from establishing any mystic communion between Himself and His disciples at His last supper, Jesus declares that the Kingdom will come immediately and will allow Him to partake anew of the everlasting feast with them. The idea of this communion in the sense given to it by Paul, and the Pauline doctrine of atonement, are really inspired by the old Mystery-religions." That is, the synoptic tradition is a piece of apostolic theology which has altered the primitive idea of a brotherly feast. Similarly the stories of the resurrection are attempts to express the supreme value of the historical personality of Jesus. In short, the Jesus whom Dr. Piepenbring discovers is a noble Jewish prophet, greater than all others, within or without Judaism, but not divine in the sense of the apostolic Church. He believed Himself to be Messiah. But all the predictions and the divine claims, including the miraculous elements, are the result of the Pauline or apostolic theology. This point of view is well known, and Dr. Piepenbring states it clearly, but without any particularly fresh contribution. Historically it is open to some serious criticism, which is not met in these pages. The only work in English upon the subject with which Dr. Piepenbring seems to be acquainted is Dr. Estlin Carpenter's small good book on the first three gospels. The result is that much of his argument is invalidated by a failure to understand how fundamentally the position which he adopts has been undermined by recent

criticism. However the early Church started, it did not start from admiration of the genius of a human Jesus, and the newer movements of research have led to a much more adequate recognition of the relation between Paul and Jesus than these pages realise.

* * * * *

Professor E. F. Scott's *Ethical Teaching of Jesus* (Macmillan : 6*s*. net) is on a different level. It is confined to one aspect of Jesus, but the writer declares frankly that the ethical teaching is bound up with the religious teaching of our Lord. "Jesus was something else than a lawgiver or reformer. He came with a message from God, and his ethic has no meaning apart from his religion." This indeed is one of the services rendered by the Fourth Gospel, according to Professor Scott. The author of that document "presents the religion under forms of thought which cannot have been those of Jesus ; but he has apprehended the inner purpose of Jesus with a matchless insight and brings the moral teaching into the light of it. It would be hardly too much to say that in this manner he supplies the key to the other Gospels."

Isolating the teaching, therefore, with this proviso, Professor Scott proceeds to discuss it in a series of penetrating studies. At almost every point he succeeds in throwing fresh light upon topics which might seem either commonplaces or obvious. It may sound daring to suggest a parallel with *Ecce Homo*, for this book is written along different lines. But we do not know of any other volume which does in a matter-of-fact fashion for our day the service done for last century by Sir John Seeley's treatise. That is, we have here a keen ethical appreciation of the subject, which does not patronise Jesus and which on the other hand does not allow appreciation to evaporate into pious platitudes. There is a refreshing blend of historical judgment and moral insight. Here and there one may differ. Professor Scott takes his own line, and occasionally he seems to yield overmuch to certain views of the moral code which tend to reduce the shattering significance of what Jesus taught and was. But in the main the treatment of the ethic is not only sound but stimulating. Thus the pages on non-resistance, which show how incompatible passive resistance is with Jesus, are a true contribution, and the closing chapter upon the permanent

validity of the teaching is one of the sanest pieces which have been recently written on this subject. Though even here there is room for query. Professor Scott, for example, says that "the teaching of Jesus must stand in the last resort by its own worth, and not by the support of any arbitrary doctrine." He means a credal doctrine about the person. But what if the teaching itself contains a consciousness which points to a unique estimate of the Teacher? In that case, this element is not arbitrary. Indeed it may be argued that the energy which is the dynamic of the teaching involves a conception of the Teacher which, as a religious power, connects the worth of the teaching with Himself.

It is seldom that so quiet and ripe a study is offered as this. Professor Scott's book will remove a number of popular misconceptions and at the same time clear up a number of difficulties which are vaguely felt about the subject. Behind it lies real scholarship, which is never obtruded. But it shows more than mere scholarship. Over and again the reader feels himself in touch with an author who has insight. And insight, in dealing with this subject, is as essential as it is unluckily rare. There have been more dull books written on the ethical teaching of Jesus than upon almost any other subject in theology, with the possible exception of the doctrine of inspiration.

CURRENT LITERATURE.

Mr. Arthur Porritt's biography of *John Henry Jowett* (Hodder and Stoughton: 7*s.* 6*d.*) has by this time found its public. Dr. Jowett, he tells us, did not keep a diary, and kept very few letters. But his biographer has, with care and affection, drawn an adequate outline of his career, which has its own lessons and inspirations for Christian preachers. One or two aspects of his work may be mentioned, as they appeal particularly to readers of the Expositor. (i.) He worked hard. If the study is a lounge, he would say, the pulpit will be an impertinence. (ii.) He studied his Bible assiduously. "My first counsel to the clergy," Dr. Gwatkin once said, "is, Don't tell lies; and the second is, Don't have a dusty Bible." Dr. Jowett did not need the second of these counsels. (iii.) He paid extraordinary

attention to style and diction; he realised the power of a words over an audience. (iv.) He read conscientiously the new papers and the religious weeklies "as part of his preparation fo the pulpit." (v.) He maintained steadily the life of prayer, and this contributed powerfully to the spiritual impressiveness of his services. This biography emphasises the old truth that what appears to be easy depends upon prolonged labour; the very simplicity which made Dr. Jowett's evangelical preaching so effective in many quarters was the result of scrupulous labour spent upon even the details of his vocation.

* * * * *

The fourth volume of *The Westminster Version of the Sacred Scriptures* (Longmans, Green & Co.: 5*s.* net) contains translations of Hebrews, James, Peter, Jude, the Pastoral and the Johannine Epistles, with some notes and simple introductions for the benefit of the Roman Catholic laity. The translations are as literal as possible, though "presbyter" is rendered "priest," e.g. in 1 Timothy v. 17 ("Let the priests who rule well be held worthy of double honour"). The Comma Johanneum is retained, but with a note to the effect that "in the opinion of nearly all critics and of most Catholic writers of the present day the words were not contained in the original text; at the same time, until further action be taken by the Holy See it is not open to Catholic editors to eliminate the words from a version made for the use of the faithful." Within the obvious restrictions of such a version, the editors have managed to convey a good deal of useful exposition. One sympathises with their difficulties. Thus, in explaining James v. 14 f., the translator does not hesitate to admit that, although "it is the teaching of the Church that St. James is here speaking of the sacrament of Extreme Unction . . . nevertheless it seems more likely that the Apostle is including the sacrament of Penance also." Then he adds, however, that "Confess your sins to one another" indicates in the concrete confession to "the priests, considered as a part of the community"!

* * * * *

The fifth edition of Principal Cairns' *Reasonableness of the Christian Faith* (Hodder and Stoughton: 3*s.* 6*d.*) contains a new preface. Hegel once said that "a nation which has a false or a bad conception of God has also a bad state, bad government,

laws." Dr. Cairns reiterates that the converse of this must true, and explains that the purpose of his book is to exhibit he world's need of Christ's full revelation of the Father. The wide circulation of such an admirably toned volume is a welcome sign of the times ; Dr. Cairns has put into it a Christian wisdom which is singularly persuasive.

* * * * *

Myths and Legends of India. By J. M. Macfie, M.A. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. Price 8*s*.

This is an introduction to the study of Hinduism, managed in the best of all ways. Mr. Macfie selects the most salient and noble parts of the vast Hindu mythology and traditions—i.e. as much as he can, within his limits—and puts the Western reader into touch with it. Evidently he has also in mind the intelligent modern Indian, who "is only too often ignorant of his own treasures." The material is divided into two sections ; the first deals with the gods and supernatural men, the second with the ordinary life of the people. Mr. Macfie's collection of stories, especially in the second part, shows a delightful sense of humour, a good-natured piety, and a kindly spirit, which are most attractive. It is a pleasure to receive a volume like this from a scholar who is sympathetic as well as critical ; the pages are readable, and they are bound to awaken an intelligent interest in the people whose religion goes back to such sacred books. Mr. Macfie explains, in his introduction, one matter which is often bewildering to Western people. How are Hindus so much better than most of the deities they worship ? How are their motives often higher than those attributed to their gods ? Because, Mr. Macfie points out, "the Hindu has no intention, in most cases at least, of following the example of gods who, with the exception of Rama, are possessed of lower moral qualities than his own." That is, his worship of them does not inspire his best morality. A critic of Euripides describes the gods in one of his plays as "doing their not very intelligent best." The deities in Hinduism do not always do even what is decent. Yet Hinduism apparently can permit or inspire people to ignore the pranks and passions of their traditional gods. This is one of the many interesting facts which Mr. Macfie's delightful volume illustrates afresh.

* * * * *

Professor E. I. Bosworth, of Oberlin, publishes a study of the synoptic gospels, called *The Life and Teaching of Jesus* (New York : the Macmillan Company, 10*s.* 6*d.*), which is written from a point of view not very different from that in Dr. Headlam's recent work. It is critical and reverent. Professor Bosworth recognises frankly that the gospels show traces of interests in the Apostolic Church which have to some extent affected the representation of what Jesus said and did. But he believes that critical methods can recover the real meaning and outline of his life on earth. On the vexed question of eschatology, for example, he thinks that Jesus finally " felt himself to be carrying the Kingdom with him as an unostentatious present fact as well as a future cataclysmic expectation." But we have moved away from the latter view. " As the will of God has unfolded, a thought-world has come into being in which the idea of development has to a certain extent displaced the idea of cataclysm (development may include cataclysm). Modern thinking in all its provision for the long future counts upon an evolution vitalised by the will of God and not upon an end of the age near at hand. If the immortal spirit of Jesus is in constant touch with the life of each generation, he would certainly wish to see men make new applications of his principles, however different from his own, in order to be true to the unfolding will of God in this new thought world " (pp. 254, 255). This quotation will show the candid spirit which characterises Professor Bosworth's book. It is a well-arranged study of the subject, along liberal lines. The writer's aim is to render the religious experience and personality of Jesus intelligible to modern students, and he has endeavoured to avail himself of " the results of more than a century of devout scholarship," not by merely repeating what previous critics have written but by stating what his own mind has found among them to be reliable.

* * * * *

Dr. Headlam's new book on *The Church of England* (London : John Murray, 12*s.*) contains his episcopal charge, delivered in order to elucidate the historical and religious position of the English Church. It is characterised by all the vigour and breadth to which we are accustomed in Dr. Headlam's recent work. Some sections of his volume, e.g. the pages on the organisation of cathedrals, are of domestic interest, but the

greater part of the argument has an interest for all intelligent readers, particularly the discussions of what is to be the relation between the English Church and either the Roman Catholic or the other non-Anglican Churches. Dr. Headlam frankly says of the latter, "I do not find any principle on which we can rule any of these bodies outside the Church, even if we find in them serious imperfections. . . . There is really no church which can justify its claim to be the one true Church." He also, in another connexion, observes that the theological colleges have not been an unmixed blessing to the Church of England; they are responsible, he argues, for "the falling off of the intellectual interests of the clergy and the predominance of party motives. . . . If we could have strong centres in the universities they may be powerful adjuncts. If they are looked upon as the right place for the training of the clergy, the result will be as harmful as that of the seminary of the Church of Rome." There is a reasoned courage about Dr. Headlam's deliverances which makes them good reading. He unites courtesy with conviction in a singularly attractive fashion, and his re-statement of Anglicanism is most timely.

* * * * *

Father Vassall-Phillips publishes an English translation and edition of the tract written by Cyprian *De Catholicæ Ecclesiæ Unitate*, under the title of "On the Unity of the Catholic Church" (London: The Manresa Press, 3*s*. 6*d*. net). It is convenient to have a small, handy English version of this attack upon schismatics, which in the judgment of its latest translator is "perhaps the most characteristic" of Cyprian's treatises. But the version has been prepared for the purpose of meeting Anglican refutations of papalism. Hence the introduction contains assertions such as this, that "history shows us the Pope ruling and teaching all over the world from the beginning"—which is apt to make the historical student read no further. There is an appendix in defence of the "interpolations" in the text of the *de Unitate*, based on Dom Chapman's arguments.

* * * * *

Nine lectures on *Education and Religion* (Hodder and Stoughton, 5*s*. net) have been edited by Dean Burroughs, of Bristol, who himself contributes the first and the last. The other seven are by Dr. Cyril Norwood, Sir Michael Sadler, Dr. Cyril A. Alington,

Dr. J. B. Rae, Mr. H. C. White, the headmaster of Westminster School, Mr. C. S. Woodward, and Mr. R. H. L. Sheppard. The Archbishop of Canterbury, in a foreword, says emphatically that after forty years of experience he has never known a time "when the vital principles of religious education had a support so varied and yet so coherent as they have to-day." He adds that "to read and digest what these large-minded thinkers say will give both stimulus and hope." This is an opinion which any reader of the book will accept gladly. It is a valuable symposium, written by experts, and by experts who, though with views of their own, are not doctrinaires. One of the most interesting of the addresses is by a medical man, Dr. Rae, upon "Psychology and Religion." He recognises the limitations of psychology, but he makes clear, to the non-medical reader, how medical diagnosis along modern lines may be serviceable to religion. Incidentally he deprecates "the practice of *always* giving a child a reason. It is important that he should learn that we must sometimes obey without understanding." Another extremely suggestive address is Mr. Woodward's, upon "Children and Guardianship," which gives advice, based on experience, as to the method of conducting attractive services for children. But indeed the whole book is alive with vital suggestions; one recommendation of it is that each essayist or lecturer speaks his own mind, and that there is sufficient unity of aim to prevent the lectures from being a heterogeneous collection.

* * * * *

In *L'Ame Religieuse des Russes* (Pontificio Instituto Orientale: Piazza della Pilotta, 35, Roma), M. Michel D'Herbigny analyses the present religious phenomena of unhappy Russia, by means of books and articles written by Russians or their friends. The monograph falls into two parts; the first describes the effects of the Soviet persecution upon the churches, while the second is devoted to the reaction set up among the emigrants, who have escaped from the terror. The author's hope and desire is that the present crisis may lead to the assimilation of the Greek Christians to the Papacy, and he naturally tabulates any scraps of evidence which may seem to point in this direction. Among the emigrants it is not surprising that a despairing indifference has seized some, while others are more keen than ever on their Orthodox, anti-Roman faith; indeed one group

openly writes and agitates in favour of Russia breaking entirely with Europe, and especially with the Roman Church as the most culpable of all who have corrupted poor Russia. As for the moral perversion of Russia by the Soviet policy, M. D'Herbigny's quotations and references only serve to corroborate the scepticism with which some recent pro-Soviet books in this country have been received. The schools and theatres are being filled with blasphemous travesties of the life of Christ, deliberately put before the young and the popular mind in order to destroy the moral and the religious ideals. Whether the surviving elements of religious feeling will succeed in preserving themselves, and how long the reaction will be allowed to proceed, are questions to which no one apparently can give any answer. There may be hope yet, in the alleged religious instincts of the peasantry, and—despite M. D'Herbigny—in the movement towards Western Protestantism. But it is a pitiful spectacle.

* * * * *

Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton have issued a new edition, the third, of Sir Henry Jones' *Old Memories* (3*s.* 6*d.*) and a volume of his *Essays on Literature and Education* (8*s.* 6*d.*), the latter edited by Professor Hetherington. These furnish a timely sequel to his biography. The seven essays include studies of Sir Walter Scott and Tennyson, and also a lecture on "The Ethical Idea in Shakespeare," besides the chapter he contributed to the "Cambridge History of English Literature" upon the Brownings. "I am a Celt, unmodified and unrepentant, and Tennyson was a Saxon in every fibre of his mind; and Celt and Saxon never can quite understand each other." Still, though Jones was a Browning man, he could see the greatness of Tennyson; he could say, "Tennyson's fame wades amongst our floating opinions like the moon amongst the clouds, and his silvery light is often obscured." The shortest piece is at the end of the book; it is not an essay but notes of a talk to some wounded soldiers during the war, notes that begin with the characteristic remark, "I was looking for something to say that would let me respect myself and leave untarnished my reverence for what you have done and suffered." Then he began to speak to the men on the dignity of human nature.

CURRENT ISSUES.

More than forty years ago Matthew Arnold made a prediction. He was analysing popular Christianity in its use of the New Testament. He noted how it was fond of dwelling upon certain texts and passages, seizing upon them and building up a theology out of them. But meanwhile other texts remained "in shadow." And he looked for the day when "these deeper texts will gradually come more and more into notice and prominence and use." Well, texts have their vogue. Some are more popular than others, naturally; some deserve to be. But certain deep words are apt to be ignored, or, as Arnold said, to lie "in shadow."

* * * * *

I remember Sir William Robertson Nicoll once telling me that he had been listening to sermons in all sorts of churches for I forget how many years, and had never once heard a sermon on the words of St. Paul about being "accepted in the Beloved." This was not the kind of text that Arnold meant, however. He cited, as specimens of texts at present in shadow, "This is life eternal, to know Thee, the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom Thou hast sent," and "The kingdom of God is righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit." Well, his prediction has been fulfilled. Anyone who has followed the course of religious life during the last forty years will admit that these texts have come into their own.

* * * * *

Professor J. M. Shaw of Halifax has found another text which he thinks has fallen out of use in our day. It is the saying, "Ye must be born anew." Professor Shaw has published a book of lectures on *The Christian Gospel of the Fatherhood of God*, one of those fresh, thoughtful books upon an old subject which reward the reader. He concludes the lectures with a sermon upon these words from the Fourth Gospel, in order to bring out the relation between the Divine Fatherhood and

regeneration. But why "regeneration"? Because, says Professor Shaw, this is essential to any salvation, individual or social.

* * * * *

Sonship, he argues, is not a natural endowment, like childship, towards God. Only once in history has divine childship developed naturally into divine sonship, and that was in our Lord Jesus Christ. The rest of us break away from the Father, and so from one another. We regain our sonship by believing in Christ and owning His control of our lives. And this puts us once more into the true attitude of brotherhood towards our fellowmen. This and nothing else. What the world requires for social health and peace is a new spirit, a new heart in men. He quotes an American publicist who declares that peace and prosperity will return to the business world "when wage-worker and employer change their point of view towards life and become born again, becoming possessed by new and better motives in life, and realising that we are here to serve rather than to be served."

* * * * *

What are the main qualities that make for success in the pastoral work of the Christian ministry? It is obvious that any success here depends upon personal character. One must be able to win people's confidence, and that means a victory over temptations to self-conceit and indolence and patronising. But are there any special qualities which tell? We may mention two.

* * * * *

The first of them is hopefulness. To do good in pastoral work the clergyman or minister must bring with him something like a breath of fresh air, some uplift of spirit. Many of those with whom he has to deal are depressed or languid or anxious; some even may be almost desperate. It is an enormous help to such natures to come into contact with one who is sympathetic and hopeful.

"And you who doubt the sky
And fear the sun—
You, Christian with the pack,
You shall not wander back,
For I am hopeful, I
Will cheer you on."

This is an essential function of the Christian minister. He must in his own way be fulfilling the rôle which Matthew Arnold, in his lines on Rugby Chapel, declared that Dr. Arnold fulfilled.

* * * * *

The second quality is love. Not an amiable sentiment, but the devotion to those for whom God has made one responsible, a devotion which makes one loyal, thoughtful, and patient. I wrote lately about Dr. Powicke's life of Richard Baxter. Well, the Bishop of Durham has published in the *Contemporary Review* for January his memorial address on Baxter, and he singles out this quality in the great Puritan divine. Baxter, he says, "might be provoking and unreasonable, he often was, but then he was so plainly sincere, so unselfish, so brave, so full of love, that men fell under the spell of a personal influence which they could neither question nor resist. The secret of his pastoral triumphs was his great capacity for love." Which is quite intelligible. People quickly know whether a clergyman or a minister is genuinely interested in them as individuals. They can feel, though they cannot explain, when the man helps them because their welfare means more to him than anything else. They are unmoved by gush, and as unmoved by any professional zeal. But the spirit of unselfish affection reaches them and rallies them. And so the relationship becomes truly Christian.

* * * * *

The series of "The Ten Best Books" has to be interrupted this month in order to make room for the first of Dr. Adolf Keller's articles upon the remarkable new movement in Continental Theology. How far that movement is reactionary will be seen as Dr. Keller proceeds to analyse its contribution. Meantime it is significant that such an emphasis should be laid upon the objective element in Christianity. There are signs abroad that the preoccupation with the subjective side of religion, which characterises psychological research, is provoking a more or less wise protest. The movement described by Dr. Keller is one of these signs, and it is well for us in this country to mark it, as none of the writings produced by this group of scholars has yet been translated into English.

A THEOLOGY OF CRISIS.

I.

OVER-NIGHT, so to speak, Continental Theology, at least in Germany and Switzerland, was found to be in a new position, since Karl Barth had thrown his *Römerbrief* [1] into the field of theological discussion. In a very short time this book and the new problems it raised became the topic of innumerable articles in theological Reviews [2] and of a very vivid controversy in theological conferences. Theological works published since then [3] could not escape facing the new problems raised by Karl Barth and his group (Gogarten, Brunner), and a controversial literature is *in statu nascendi* among which the little book of Martin Werner [4] may be mentioned here as a very sagacious polemical essay. Two new editions of the *Römerbrief* followed the first, rapidly. The second one left no stone standing upon another in the first edition, but strengthened the whole position and gave an answer to many objections which had been raised against this new interpretation of St. Paul. A number of shorter papers were collected and edited by K. Barth in his last book, *Das Wort Gottes und die Theologie*,[5] wherein Barth tried to depict some specific aspects of his new theology, especially in the lectures or essays on "Der Christ in der

[1] Karl Barth, *Der Römerbrief.*, Bern; G. A. Bäschlin, 1919. 2nd and 3rd edition, Chr. A. Kaiser, München, 1922.

[2] *Die christliche Welt*, 1921–24 (Marburg), a series of articles by Harnack, Jülicher, Barth and others. *Theologische Blätter*, 1922–23, articles by Tillich, Gogarten, Hein and K. Schmidt. *Ztschr. f. Theologie u. Kirche*, 1922 and 1923, articles by Knittermeyer, Wünsch and Gogarten. *Protestantenblatt*, articles by Schubring and others. *Zwischen den Zeiten*, 1923, article by Hirsch.

[3] M. Rade, *Glaubenslehre*, 1924.

[4] Martin Werner, *Das Weltanschauungsproblem bei Karl Barth und Albert Schweitzer*, Paul Haupt, Bern, 1924.

[5] Verlag. Chr. Kaiser, München, 1924.

Gesellschaft," "Biblische Fragen," "Not und Verheissung der christlichen Verkündigung," "das Problem der Ethik in der Gegenwart," "das Wort Gottes als Aufgabe der Theologie," and "Reformierte Lehre, ihr Wesen und ihre Aufgabe." Some of these papers had been published before, separately. The group around Barth edits also a Review, *Zwischen den Zeiten*.[1] Two volumes of sermons have been published by K. Barth and E. Thurneysen under the title *Komm, Schöpfer Geist*, and *Suchet Gott, so werdet ihr leben*.[2]

Karl Barth, born 1886, was pastor of a Swiss Reformed parish in Safenwil. The *Römerbrief* lifted him to a chair of Reformed Theology in the theological Faculty of the University of Göttingen. This chair, in a Faculty of Lutheran history and character, was created by means of a private endowment, mostly from American Reformed Churches, and is therefore not included in the official body of the University. Similar unofficial chairs, endowed by private societies, exist in other Universities, especially in Switzerland. The new professor attracted at once unusual interest, and started, especially among the students and younger theologians, a movement which fertilised theological interests over the whole field. He was seconded, on the Lutheran side, by F. Gogarten,[3] on the Reformed side by Emil Brunner[4] and by Eduard Thurneysen ;[5] these last two are Swiss theologians, the former being professor of Systematic Theology in Zürich, the latter pastor in St. Gall.

[1] Edited by W. Merz, Verlag Kaiser, München.

[2] Verlag Kaiser, München, 1923. Cf. also Karl Barth and Ed. Thurneysen, *Zur innern Lage des Christentums*, Verlag Kaiser, München.

[3] F. Gogarten, *Die religiöse Entscheidung*, Eugen Diederichs, Jena, 1921. Id., *Religion weither*; id. *Religion und Volkstum*.

[4] Emil Brunner, *Erlebnis, Erkenntnis und Glaube*, J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen, 1921. Id., *Die Mystik und das Wort*, 1923. Id., *Grenzen der Humanität*, 1922, Antrittsvorlesung.

[5] Eduard Thurneysen, *Dostojewsky*, and in the volume of Sermons *Komm, Schöpfer Geist*.

Barth would not admit that he is founding a new theological School or party. It would also be difficult to attach him to any of the dominating theological tendencies, or to characterise him with one of the numerous -isms with which theological history abounds. Although trying to shape new thoughts in theological form and building up even a new systematic theology on the exegetical and historic basis laid by Barth, the whole group would rather consider its work as a necessary criticism of every theology, as a critical footnote to be put under all theological and ecclesiastical activity, or as a bit of " cinnamon " strewn on every theological dish which present-day protestantism is enjoying. The spiritual forefathers of the whole movement are Blumhardt, Overbeck, Kierkegaard, the Reformers Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, and first of all Saint Paul. It will be explained later why the father of modern theology, Schleiermacher, and the later orthodox theologians and leaders of modern protestantism, Harnack, Tröltsch, Bousset and Wernle, are omitted in this ancestry. In the eyes of Barth and his friends the tendency represented by this latter group of modern theologians and designated occasionally as " Kulturprotestantismus," is a deplorable deviation from the truth underlying the Christian religion, a kind of theological fall for which they should do penance in sackcloth and ashes.

The theology of Barth, according to his own testimony, must be considered as an expression of that deep and incurable crisis into which men, Christian laymen as well as professors, the Church as well as theology, are thrown irresistibly as soon as they are really confronted with the living God. *Crisis* is the only word which depicts adequately this situation. And in fact this " crisis " always breaks out when God is discovered to be something quite different from anything that men thought of Him in their religious convictions. This crisis starts from the conflict between

the eternal human desire to know God, to make an image of Him, to possess Him, to express His being in human forms, and the terrifying discovery that there is no way from man to God, that no human thinking, not even the highest moral or religious vision, can get hold of Him. We touch here the very centre of this theology, the *transcendency of God*. Barth blames the whole modern theology for laying too much emphasis on the immanence of God and for suppressing thereby the distance between God and men. The assurance with which modern theology speaks of God is "superbia," nothing else than a manifestation of the same revolutionary spirit which led humanity to the Fall. In the *hybris* of this assurance there is, however, little difference between orthodoxy or mysticism and the attitude of modern theology. Although orthodoxy in its supernaturalism has at least kept an idea of the mystery in which God wraps Himself, it claims to give in its dogma a too direct and too concrete cognition of God and his aims, and forgets that God is hidden, that He is the *unknown* God. What we call God, is not the living God, but a humanised image we made of Him.

Barth directs, from this point of view, his specific and furious attacks against modern historicism and psychologism. Being under the task of preaching, when a minister, he felt the utter inadequacy of this theology which speaks about the incidentals of historic explanations, of textual conjectures, of psychological data, but not of the essential and paradoxical fact that the absolute and holy God has a special message for man in his sinful relativity. All the exegetic art, all the by-work given by a better knowledge of the historic situation, the whole category of causality applied to the men of God and their works, are of no use for the conscience in its terrible need when it feels itself contemplated by the eternal eye which looks through all the

barriers we erect against it. The preacher who realises the depth of this "crisis" can no more preach.[1] He is unable to take God's word on his lips; "God is in heaven, we are on earth." An unbridgeable chasm is between Him and us. We cannot speak of Him, and our last word can only be a trembling question. It is "hybris" to build a theology, as Schleiermacher did, on the religious data which are to be found in human souls, on a religious self-consciousness or experience which is fallacious and unable to throw a bridge to the unknown world of God. In so far as the whole modern theology has undergone the influence of Schleiermacher, it has lost[2] what the Reformers knew; viz., that God is inaccessible in His sovereignty, and that by no means, not even by the most sublime religious vision or the noblest moral effects can God be found until He reveals Himself according to His Free Will.

But even the revelation of God cannot be understood or assimilated by men in an immediate and too direct way. It can never be made visible or palpable, for instance, in nature or history.[3] It can never be shown or proved as a distinctive element in this world. As soon as Christians pretend to express His Being in specific concepts, or to represent His existence or action in visible forms or in symbols, He disappears, wraps Himself in clouds of an unapproachable mystery, till only a questionable human image remains in man's soul. God is hidden also in the creation. Nature, this world as it is, is not God's work. It is not capable of making visible what is *per se* beyond all relativity of concrete existence. *Finitum non est capax infiniti.* (It was of course remarked that this entire removal of the divine element from the creation comes very near to the theology of Marcion, who ascribes the creation of the

[1] *Wort Gottes und die Theologie*, p. 99.
[2] v. Brunner, *Die Mystik und das Wort.* [3] Cf. *Wort Gottes*, p. 83.

concrete world not to the good and invisible God, but to a demiurge. Barth's theology was therefore called New-Marcionitism, occasionally.) Still more, God is a "Deus absconditus," not only in nature, but also in human experience, it is urged. He cannot be made an object of human experience. He is never an "Erlebnis" of the soul. What men mean when they speak of the God they feel present or immanent in their feelings, in their subjectivity, is not God but an idol. God is the totally Different (*Das ganz Andere*). Barth rebukes with the utmost severity any attempt at a synthesis of God and world, or of God and the Self, as mysticism tries to do.[1] To speak of "Unio mystica" is blasphemous. Mystical theology is quite the same utter impossibility as natural theology. God is not within human reach. He can only be felt as the frontier of the human existence, as the crisis of our being, as the judgment on this world. A terrible wrathful No, condemning the world and men as they are, is the only direct way by which His presense is made known to the human heart and conscience. Neither does history, whether as a whole or in a special part of it, for instance, the sacred history or the historical complex of Bible history, yield the full revelation of God. It is the specific mistake of the school of Ritschl to pretend to find God in history. God is entirely "unanschaulich." God is "the Impossible" for the human mind, the "skandalon." All that is perceivable, expressible, ceases to be God. Even the Christian faith, in so far as its human form or content is concerned, does not possess God or contain adequate elements of His cognition. Faith, to use a not very sublime image of Barth, is no more than the hole made by an exploding shell. And all human piety is no more than the bubbles rising in the shallow swamp of human existence. If God transcends all human cognition, then the only

[1] *Wort Gottes*, p. 169.

positive element in our knowledge of Him lies in negation.

From the standpoint of a theology laying all emphasis on the transcendency of God, the Church, theology, religion itself become doubtful and problematic. "Religion expresses no more than the necessary psychic reaction on the creative action of God." And in so far as Religion has to do with this psychical element, religion has always been rather an open door for obscure demonic forces than for God's revelation. "The pandemonium of human piety is dangerous to the God-seeking soul." It resembles more the half-masked world of Eros than of God. Religion is always Eve taking the apple, and her talk with the Serpent is the prototype of all sermons! Where it is sincere, it is not more than the beginning of that crisis in which all human possibilities appear as impossible and absurd. "A religious man is therefore a broken, disharmonious and restless creature." When he discovers what religion really means, he is struck with horror at the senselessless of its own existence.[1] Religion is the least human possibility in which man discovers that he is sick with God. In Church life this sickness breaks out and becomes manifest to all.

The Church tries to transform the impossible God into a possible, intelligible deity. In the Church the heavenly lightning becomes a smouldering chimney fire! The Church makes the frivolous effort to humanise God,[2] to draw Him down into Space and Time and Relativity. It is therefore condemned by God, being in the strongest opposition to His Gospel and His Kingdom. All the woes which Jesus spoke against the Synagogue are applied by Barth to the Christian Church. It means the suppression of the Gospel, just as the Gospel means the suppression of the Church. Nevertheless Christians cannot help belonging to a Church. It is

[1] *Römerbrief*, ii. pp. 227, 251 ff.
[2] *Römerbrief*, ii. p. 317 ff.

unavoidable. Still we had better realise, as members of the Church, that we stand on a forlorn post. "The Church is over." The seer in the Apocalypse of John sees no temple in the celestial city, and nowhere is the Bible interested in building up a Church. The best we can do is to suppress it and to protest incessantly against its arrogant claim to possess God, to know Him, to enable its followers to enjoy Him [1] and to save them from despair. "Religion and the Church are powers of Death." They have betrayed Christ, who has nothing to do with them.[2] All the ecclesiastical humdrum, all the multifarious activities, social and others, are nothing else than a secularisation of God's message.[3] We need not expect much from what we call the social Gospel, or from any of our soul-saving efforts; what we should do is to let God Himself do His work and wait for him alone.[4] An everlasting "No!" is thrown by God into the face and ears of all men who claim to know Him, to do His will, to work for His Kingdom, to possess His Spirit. Deepest humiliation, despair, self-condemnation and death, are therefore the human share, when God's terrible and absolute transcendency is realised.

However, if there is no way from men to the transcendent God, there is a way from God to men: Jesus Christ.[5] He is the only Revelation of God. But even in this revelation He remains the *transcendent* God, because even in the appearance of Christ we do not possess an image or an explanation of God; even here He is not accessible as the manifest Deity. Even in the historic life of Christ He touches the human soul only as a tangent touches a circle; even here no efflux of

[1] *Wort Gottes*, p. 80 ff. [2] *Wort Gottes*, p. 94.

[3] The voice of the Church is that of the Great Inquisitor in Dostojewsky (*Brothers Karamazoff*), entreating Jesus to go away and not to come back again.

[4] *Wort Gottes*, pp. 33.

[5] *Römerbrief*, p. 68; *Wort Gottes*, pp. 86 a.o.

divine forces is visible or tangible. In so far as the life of Christ forms a part of history, it is quite as problematic as everything in history. All the attempts to find in the life of Christ the glory of the invisible God are futile, not of any greater value than other attempts to exhibit our sham knowledge in the market of religious life.

The only real Revelation of God in Christ is to be found in His Death.[1] In revealing Himself in this paradoxical way God remains hidden. His transcendency is not given up, because He reveals Himself, paradoxically enough, in the Cross, which means the end, the death of all that is human, the frontier of our understanding, the *consummatio mundi*, the break of all organic development, the end of this æon. On the cross Jesus places Himself near sinners and shares their despair in the question: "My God, why hast thou forsaken me?" This question shows that every human possibility has come to an end—it marks the death of human thinking and reckoning, of human religion and morals and hopes. Nothing remains in this utter bankruptcy of man except only a new possibility, which is God's possibility alone, beyond all that can be imagined or grasped; in the Cross, the despair, the blood, the death of Christ, God shows us no more than the dialectic truth that He vivifies by killing, that He reigns by bringing man to his end. He says no more. In letting His Son die with His terrible question, He reveals Himself as the God who is eternally silent and hidden. His means of expression are not power and glory, as we understand them, but Silence, Death, the Cross. It is the end of history, the beginning of the new era of the resurrection. The last word of history is the judgment, the despair which Jesus had to face not as hero, not as a revealer of higher or occult forces, not as leader or thinker. But in this supreme negation[2] which He suffered willingly with

[1] *Wort Gottes*, p. 86. [2] *Römerbrief*, ii. p. 74.

sinners, He points to God as the only unattainable position which is left. So, by His Death, Christ announces the dying of man as the last necessity, and God as the vivifying God who creates a new heaven and earth and a new man according to His Free Will. This new creature, the man of resurrection,[1] relies no more on his own natural resources, on his own efforts, on his morality or his religion, but exclusively on the Grace of God, on the fidelity of God towards us.

But what is God's gift in the cross? The atonement through the blood of Christ, the resurrection of a new God-born creature, the *δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ*, is not accessible to our cognition or our experience. Here again we have to do with the "hidden" God, who even in the revelation of Christ is veiling Himself quite as much as revealing Himself. God is never a direct object of our experience.[2] We cannot see, know, prove, or feel, that Jesus is the Christ, that God is in Him as the killing and vivifying Power of Supreme Life. All that we see on the Cross is, so to speak, the outstretched finger pointing towards something which is hidden and which can only be *believed*. It is only a hint (*Hinweis*), and faith alone can understand it. The mystery of the atonement[3] in the blood of Christ is and remains God's mystery. It is not made visible or intelligible to man, but only to faith. Faith is the organ for the invisible. Barth[4] quotes here Luther, who said: "Because faith has to do with invisible things, all that faith can claim must be hidden. It is hidden in the deepest sense if the content of faith is opposed to the senses and to experience. Therefore, when God vivifies, He kills. When He justifies, He does it by making us guilty. When He leads us to Heaven, He does it by throwing us into hell."

[1] *Wort Gottes*, p. 94; *Römerbrief*, p. 169.

[2] *Wort Gottes*, p. 95. Even Christ's resurrection is not a historic event; Jesus belongs neither to history nor to psychology.

[3] *Römerbrief*, ii. p. 82.

[4] *Römerbrief*, ii. p. 16.

There is no other way for accepting the gospel of salvation than by faith. This is the paradox of faith which is respect for God's *incognito*, the acceptance of the terrible contradiction between the visible world of our experience and the invisible world and action of God's fidelity towards men. The act of faith in itself is quite as mysterious, as paradoxical as any other act of God. The intellectual expression of faith, the fervour of sentiment, the power of conviction, the degree of morality which it may produce, are not essential in the act of faith, but accessory human elements in a spiritual process which in itself can never be grasped as a positive datum, but only as the negation of other positive data.[1] Faith is faith only in so far as it does not pretend to yield any historic or psychological realities, but exclusively the hidden reality of God. It is submission to what is never our possession or our own deed. It is a standpoint in the air and therefore an impossible standpoint. But the impossible in human eyes is exactly the category of the Divine. Therefore faith can never give a saving or protecting assurance to the heart. It is always a risk, a leap into the uncertain.[2] Barth agrees entirely with the dictum, "Credo quia absurdum." Faith is in fact the only miracle. Clearness, comprehension, rationality, evidence, these are therefore sure signs of the absence of faith. As Faith in fact is God's miracle in the soul, it is hidden in the same way as God's work, and therefore there is no discrimination possible between men who believe and others who do not believe. The faithful is indistinguishable from the sinner. God alone knows them—a truth which Barth and his group find confirmed by [3] many descriptions in the work of Dostojewsky.

This analysis, given as far as possible in Barth's own words, tries to show to what extent Barth is stressing the trans-

[1] *Römerbrief*, ii. p. 17. [2] *Römerbrief*, ii. p. 75.
[3] E. Thurneysen, *Dostojewsky*.

cendency of God. God is the great Unknown, the Stranger to man. What comes from God is unknowable, impalpable, inaccessible to human experience. The only thing which is knowable is the negation. The only experience is the judgment, God's "*No!*" spoken to humanity. The only evidence is the necessity of dying. But in accepting this judgment, we are saved. In hearing the terrible "No!" we are sure of God's redeeming "Yes!" In being ready to die, we are given the new life of resurrection.

We face here another characteristic of this theology of crisis: its *dialectic* method.

ADOLF KELLER.

(*To be continued.*)

THE VISITS OF JESUS TO JERUSALEM.

THE older Gospel-harmonies and lives of Jesus in vogue a generation ago were constructed on the assumption that the Gospel-data made it possible to restore, not indeed with finality and certitude, but with a high degree of probability, the true sequence of events in our Lord's public life.[1] For this purpose, the different arrangements of all four Gospels were laid under contribution: now one, now the other of them, was given the preference. Modern critical study has done much to break up the confidence felt in these popular reconstructions, and is inclined to regard the whole effort as a forlorn hope. It is urged that Mark wrote his Gospel *οὐ . . . τάξει*; that 'Matthew,' with his artistic arrangement of masses of teaching alternating with clusters of incidents, is obviously valueless for chronology;[2] that Luke

[1] See, for example, Farrar, *Life of Christ*, Pref., chs. xvi. init., xxii. init.

[2] How utterly devoid 'Matthew' was of a sense of chronology comes out strikingly in two places. In xiv. 12 f. he makes John's execution the starting-point of a fresh series of incidents in Jesus' life: yet the execution

simply copies Mark's order, omitting unaccountably one considerable section and massing the bulk of his non-Marcan material in two groups (each arranged anyhow—for lack of full knowledge [1]) at two arbitrarily chosen points in Mark's programme ; and that the Fourth Gospel, with its free doctrinal handling of the whole tradition, and especially its transfer of the Temple-cleansing to the beginning of the ministry, cannot be taken seriously in its presentation of an elaborate schema of Jewish festivals.[2] Hence we are urged to forego the futile task of endeavouring to discover the march of events—and with it, of course, the psychological development of Jesus—during the period of His public ministry.[3]

It is good and right that a check should be given from time to time to our natural tendency to assume that we know more than we actually do. Yet on this matter it may be doubted whether an absolute ' non possumus ' is really the only sound attitude. Waiving finally all hope of arriving at certainty *in details*, we may yet plead

(1) that Mark's lack of τάξις may well refer to literary

itself is introduced in a purely parenthetical section inserted to explain the statement in the main thread of narrative that Antipas (sometime *after* John's execution) began to wonder who Jesus was. The main thread is thus dropped in favour of one that begins at an earlier point in the story : yet the two never meet, nor is their interrelation made clear. Again, at the moment of Jesus' death (xxvii. 50–53), an earthquake opens the tombs, and many saints rise bodily, and " after his resurrection " enter Jerusalem, and appear to many. What were they doing between Friday and Sunday ? Furthermore, as McNeile points out in his *Gospel according to St. Matthew* (p. 48*b*), ' Matthew ' is wrong as against Luke in the position he gives to the so-called Sermon on the Mount.

[1] There is at least one obvious example of this—Luke xvi. 14–18.

[2] Wellhausen, for example (*Das Evangelium Johannis*, pp. 28, 105), emphatically rejects the Johannine chronology as intended to lengthen the public activity of Jesus to several years, and argues that the notes of time in John vi. 4, x. 22 serve no real purpose in the narrative.

[3] Typical of this modern critical attitude are Lohmeyer's recent reviews of Headlam's *Life of Jesus* in *Theol. Ltztg.* 1923, No. 22, 466–469, and of Cadman's *Last Journey of Jesus to Jerusalem*, in *Theol. Ltztg.* 1924, No. 18, 401. Cf. Bousset, *Was wissen wir von Jesus ?* pp. 51 f., 62.

articulation and form, rather than chronology, and that the Gospel shows clear traces of an historical appreciation of the development of events : [1]

(2) that Luke makes an explicit claim to have written καθεξῆς, which clearly means in chronological order ;

(3) that in regard to the Fourth Gospel, while the insertion of much imaginary discourse and the exploitation of narrative in the interests of doctrine and symbolism are not to be questioned, yet it is not possible, without much forcing and unnaturalness, to apply the theory of "tendency" or ulterior religious motive to the whole of the Johannine narrative. Much of it can be naturally accounted for only on the supposition that it is genuine tradition regarding actual occurrences.[2] And when once it is admitted that even the Synoptics *imply* more than one visit of Jesus to Jerusalem before the Passion,[3] there is at least a prima facie case for regarding the *main* Johannine story as historical (even supposing that the position it gives to the Temple-cleansing is erroneous).[4]

Let us now see what happens if we assume these moderate pleas to be justified, and proceed to compare the Johannine and Synoptic outlines. We set aside John i.–iv. 44 as dealing with the period before the Galilæan ministry opens —a period, apparently, of about nine months, viz. : from a little before the Passover (ii. 12 f.), i.e. March or April, to four months before harvest (iv. 35), i.e. December.[5] There is no

[1] We may quote, not only Swete, *Mark* (1923), pp. lvii.–lxii., Menzies, *Earliest Gospel*, pp. 20 f., 29–31, and Stanton, *Gospels as Historical Documents*, ii. pp. 185–188, but also H. J. Holtzmann, *Neutest. Theol.* (1911), i. pp. 472 f.

[2] This is well brought out in A. E. Brooke's essay on 'The Historical Value of the Fourth Gospel' in *Cambridge Biblical Essays* (1909), pp. 291 ff.

[3] Moffatt, *ILNT*, pp. 541–544.

[4] It is well known that the Fourth Gospel is thought by most scholars to be in the right as against the Synoptics in the matter of the date of the crucifixion.

[5] Against the widely accepted suggestion that iii. 22–30 should be

Synoptic counterpart to this Johannine section, beyond the narratives of the Lord's baptism and temptation. Further, we must transpose John v. and vi. and make certain other adjustments which are necessitated by the dislocation of the contents of the Gospel.[1] The Fourth Gospel then gives us (after the December of iv. 35) :

a Passover (vi. 4) at the time of the crowd-feeding, in the midst of a Galilæan ministry ;

a visit to Jerusalem for an unnamed feast (v. 1), usually assumed to be Pentecost ;

a further period in Galilee (vii. 1) ;

a visit to Jerusalem for the Feast of Booths (October : vii. 2, 10) ;

a visit to Jerusalem for the Feast of Dedication (December : x. 22) ;

a journey across the Jordan (x. 40) ;

the raising of Lazarus at Bethany (xi. 1–53) ;

a retirement to Ephraim (thirteen miles north of Jerusalem : xi. 54) ;

the Passover of the Passion (xi. 55 ff.).

Unless therefore the unnamed feast of v. 1 be Passover (which we have no reason to suppose), we have here a period of about fifteen months. It is surely rather a striking confirmation of this that Mark (who has no explicit dates except that of the final Passover) has, in iv., parables about sowing (which took place in January and February), in vi. 39 an allusion to the fresh "green grass" of spring

inserted between ii. 12 and 13, see *Journ. Theol. Studies*, July, 1919, pp. 316 f.

[1] The bare fact of dislocation seems to be established by the obvious necessity for transposing v. and vi. and the lack of continuity between what precedes and what follows the interpolated *Pericope Adulterae* (vii. 53–viii. 11). I accept in the main the restorations of F. W. Lewis, *Disarrangements of the Fourth Gospel*, for v.–xx. ; but comparatively few of the detailed alterations affect the chronological scheme. It is a pity that Turner, in his excellent article on 'Chronology' in Hastings' *DB*, does not assume the transposition of v. and vi.

(in connexion with the story of the crowd-feeding), and in ii. 23 ff. the account of an incident (placed before its proper time in a special group of 'conflict-accidents,' ii.–iii. 6), which probably took place shortly after Passover.[1] Thus without the help of any but the most moderate hypotheses, we may fairly claim that Mark and John are in substantial agreement as to the period between the opening of the Galilæan ministry and the Passion.[2] A further point of contact is that Mark, like 'John,' has a visit of Jesus across the Jordan shortly before the Passion (x. 1, cf. Matt. xix. 1).

How does Luke's arrangement compare with this Marco-Johannine framework? The value of his arrangement is indeed impaired somewhat by occasional obvious misplacements,[3] by the embodiment of the erroneous Marcan inclusion of only one visit to Jerusalem, viz., at the end of Jesus' life, and possibly also by the desire to compress the whole ministry within the space of twelve months (iv. 19). On the other hand, not only does Luke expressly claim to have written chronologically, and that after thorough investigation (i. 3), but the general faithfulness with which he follows Mark's order and (as most think) the original order of Q also, suffice at least to acquit him of the suspicion

[1] It was illegal to eat the new harvest's corn until the sheaf of first-fruits had been duly offered at Passover.

[2] The oft-alleged discrepancy between the Johannine and Synoptic versions in regard to the length of the ministry reduces itself therefore to the Johannine insertion of nine months' activity between the baptism of Jesus and the commencement of the Galilæan ministry proper.

[3] E.g. the visit to Nazareth (iv. 16–30) is put at the commencement of the Galilæan ministry, though the premature mention of Kapharnaum (iv. 23) proves that the later Marcan date (Mark vi. 1–6) is preferable. The synagogue incident (Luke xiii. 10–17) is probably inserted too late, in view of Jesus' growing aloofness from the synagogue. The Lucan setting of the great lamentation over Jerusalem (xiii. 34 f.: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem," etc.) has even less verisimilitude than the Matthæan (xxiii. 37–39), which is saying a good deal. See also above, p. 176, n. 1, and below, p. 191, n. 2.

of being actuated, in the arrangement of his materials, by any other interest. At one point, indeed, he seems to have been in a position to correct Mark's order. Of the two 'conflicts' in Mark iii. 22–30 (Beelzebub) and vii. 1–23 (defilement), the latter is far less violent and embittered than the former, and certainly looks like the earlier of the two.[1] Now Luke omits the dispute about defilement, but his version of the Beelzebub-incident, which is clearly taken from Q,[2] appears at a considerably later point in the story than the defilement-discourse would have occupied, had Luke inserted it in the Marcan order. We seem led to the conclusion that, where the order of Mark and Q differed, Luke gave priority to Q.[3] If he did so, his preference must have rested on a belief in its superior accuracy. But would this procedure, if established, help us? In other words, was the original order of Q chronological? Most modern scholars would be likely to exclaim in reply, with Pauline emphasis, *Μὴ γένοιτο*! There are, however, two things to be said on this point. Firstly, since Q was not simply a collection of sayings, but consisted largely of narrative, the natural arrangement for its author to adopt would be the chronological, especially if (as its obvious truthfulness and the words of Papias combine to suggest) it is from the hand of an apostolic eye-witness. Secondly, its original arrangement, as visible in the Lucan series of excerpts, reveals no trace of inherent improbability or of any artistic or artificial schematism, such as would make it useless for chronology.

It may then be put down as a preliminary finding that Luke's arrangement of events is probably even nearer the

[1] A. T. Cadoux, in the Expositor, Jan. 1918, pp. 72 f.; W. H. Cadman, *The Last Journey of Jesus to Jerusalem*, pp. 22 f., 38.

[2] B. H. Streeter in *Oxford Studies*, pp. 169–171.

[3] Another instance of this would be the parable of the mustard-seed (Luke xiii. 18 f.=Matt. xiii. 31 f.; cf. Mark iv. 30–32).

truth than Mark's, and that, although (like Mark) he makes no exact statement on the matter, his view of the duration of the minstry probably did not differ widely from that of the earlier evangelist.

The question, however, has now to be asked whether Luke gives as little support as Mark does to the Johannine series of Jerusalem visits. The Synoptic story of the ministry, down to the commencement of the final journey to Jerusalem (i.e. Mark i. 14—ix, and its parallels), contains virtually nothing that explicitly suggests Jerusalem as the scene of action, except the statement in Luke iv. 44 that Jesus was "preaching in the synagogues of Judæa," which, if the text be correct, may be a general recognition of the bare fact that Jerusalem was sometimes visited.[1] Now it is exactly at the lower point just referred to, viz., the termination of the Galilæan ministry according to Mark, that the Greater Interpolation of Luke begins (ix. 51—xviii. 14). We have, indeed, no certain knowledge of the source or sources which Luke followed throughout this large section; but it is clear (1) that none of it is drawn from Mark,[2] (2) that it contains a larger proportion of excerpts from Q than any other part of the Gospel. The simplest explanation of these data is that advanced by Dr. Streeter, viz., that the Greater Interpolation is, in the main, an extract from Q.[3] It is generally thought to give a rather loosely-knit version of a single leisurely journey from Galilee to Judæa.[4] True, Luke himself may have so regarded it:

[1] Or Judæa may simply mean Jewish territory generally (cf. i. 5, vii. 17 [around Nain], xxiii. 5 [includes Galilee], Acts x. 37 [ditto]). Some sayings in 'Matthew' (e.g. v. 23 f.) seem to have been spoken in or near Jerusalem. May we say the same of Matthew viii. 4 = Mark i. 44 (see McNeile, *Matthew*, p. 102*a*)?

[2] Sir J. C. Hawkins, in *Oxford Studies*. pp. 28–59.

[3] *Oxford Studies*, pp. 189–203.

[4] It is sometimes called the "Peræan Section" because in *Mark* x. 1–45 (=*Matt.* xix.–xx. 28) Jesus is beyond the Jordan en route for Jeru-

at any rate, nowhere in the course of it does he specifically mention that Jesus got to Jerusalem, and then left it again. But its indications of locality do not lend themselves at all well to the theory of a single journey. Thus—

ix. 51–56. Jesus starts for Jerusalem, and enters Samaritan territory.

ix. 57 He and His company are still on the road.

x. 1–20. The mission and return of the Seventy.

x. 29–37. The parable of the Good Samaritan (with its notice of the Jerusalem-Jericho road.).[1]

x. 38–42. Jesus at the home of Martha and Mary (i.e. according to John xi., Bethany, within two miles of Jerusalem).

xi. 1. He is "in a certain place," praying.

xi. 45–52. He denounces the Jewish persecution of the Prophets, etc. (? at Jerusalem: note the allusion to the Temple in verse 51).

xiii. 1–5. He calls for a national repentance (? at Jerusalem: note the mention of sacrifices, Siloam, Jerusalemites).

xiii. 10. He teaches "in one of the synagogues" on the Sabbath.

xiii. 22. He journeys through cities and villages on His way to Jerusalem.

xiii. 31–33. He is warned to flee from Antipas (therefore He is in Galilee or Peræa).[2]

xiv. 25. Great crowds journey with Him.

xvii. 11. En route to Jerusalem, he passes along

salem: but *Luke* says nothing anywhere about Jesus crossing the Jordan or visiting Peræa.

[1] Both Rush Rhees (*Life of Jesus of Naz.*, p. 157), and O. Holtzmann (*Life of Jesus* [E. T.], pp. 390, 402) believe this parable to have been spoken in or near Jerusalem.

[2] For Luke xiii. 34 f. ("O Jerusalem, Jerusalem," etc.), see above, p. 179, and below, p. 191, n. 2.

between Samaria and Galilee (i.e. probably towards the Jordan : note also the Samaritan leper in the immediate sequel).

xviii. 9–14. He utters the parable of the two men praying in the Temple (? therefore at Jerusalem).

xviii. 15 ff. are parallel to Mark x. 13 ff., the scene of which is in Peræa.

Now it is hard to believe that a literary artist like Luke would have tolerated these extraordinarily confusing notes of place, unless he had felt compelled thereto either by his authorities or by some special necessity. If they go back to Q or any other single source, we might explain them as due either to sheer clumsiness, or to some obscure accidental corruption, which has left the sequence of the sections and some of the notices of locality untouched, but has obliterated others, with the result that almost all explicit mention of Jerusalem and all trace of journeys away from Jerusalem have disappeared. More probable than either of these suppositions is the suggestion that such corruption was intentional, on the part, either of Luke himself, or of the compiler of that version of Q which Luke used as his immediate source, and that the motive of it was the fancied necessity of removing the apparent disagreement with Mark's view of Jesus' itinerary.[1]

[1] It is worth observing that of two out of the three occasions on which the indefinite τις is used of a place in the Greater Interpolation, one (x. 38) refers to Bethany (which it is difficult to imagine Luke not to have known to be the home of Martha and Mary), and the other (xi. 1) apparently to Jerusalem or to the Mount of Olives. That ἐν τόπῳ τινί in xi. 1 is a deliberate substitute for a specific place-name is probable : otherwise, why should the phrase be inserted at all ? Only once elsewhere (xvii. 12) does Luke take the trouble to indicate a locality in this vague way (εἴς τινα κώμην), and there the fact that the context is narrative (instead of teaching, as here) would suffice to explain the insertion of some note of locality, while the fact that the village was small and little known would account for the vagueness.

If we look carefully at the above list of movements, we shall see that, if chronological, it implies, not one visit to Jerusalem and its neighbourhood, but three :—

I. covers at least Luke x. 25–xiii. 9.

II. covers at least Luke xviii. 9–14.

III. is the Passion-visit, narrated by all four Gospels.

It will be remembered that the Fourth Gospel has, in the period corresponding to the Synoptic story of the ministry, *four* visits to Jerusalem :

1. for the unnamed Feast (? Pentecost), John v. 1–47, vii. 15–24, viii. 12–20.
2. for the Feast of Booths (October), John vii. 1–14, 25–52, viii. 21–59, ix., x. 19–21.
3. for the Feast of Dedication (December), John x. 22–29, 1–18, 30–39.
4. for the Passover of the Passion, John xii. ff.

Of these, No. 1 seems to have nothing whatever corresponding to it in the Synoptics ; but as John's No. 4 corresponds to Luke's No. III., may not John's Nos. 2 and 3 correspond respectively to Luke's Nos. I. and II. ?

For purposes of comparison, let us concentrate our attention on the former of these two, viz., the visit for the Feast of Booths (John vii. 1–14, 25–52, viii. 21–59, ix., x. 19–21,=[?] Luke x. 25–xiii. 9. It must be admitted that the Lucan and Johannine versions seem to have little in common, and present at least one rather glaring discrepancy. In Luke, Jesus journeys publicly, sending messengers on before Him to announce His approach and prepare for His reception ; He sends out the Seventy Missioners, and receives them on their return ; rejoices over His intimacy with God ; tells a lawyer about love to God and to man as the condition of inheriting eternal life ; utters the parable of the Good Samaritan ; visits Martha and Mary (? at Bethany) ; teaches the disciples about prayer ; replies to the charge

of being empowered by Beelzebub ; adduces the " sign " of Jonah ; dines with one of the Pharisees, and denounces them ; prepares the disciples for persecution ; refuses to be a " judge or divider " ; warns against wealth and earthly worries ; enjoins watchfulness ; alludes to His approaching " baptism " ; urges the Jews to " interpret this season " and " judge what is right " ; advises the speedy settlement of a debt-dispute ; speaks about the Galilæans whom Pilate had killed at their sacrifices and the men on whom the tower had fallen at Siloam ; and utters the parable of the barren fig-tree. In John, on the other hand, Jesus goes up to Jerusalem (after a dispute with His brothers), " not publicly, but as it were in secret." People look for Him at Jerusalem, discussing whether He be a good man or a deceiver. Half-way through the festival, He suddenly appears in the Temple, teaching ; this excites wonder, and He enters upon discussions concerning His personal claims. Attempts are made to arrest Him, but they come to nothing. This goes on until the end of the festival, when the failure of the last effort to seize Him leads to an altercation between Nikodemos and the other Pharisees. Then follows another long and acrimonious argument between Jesus and " the Jews," culminating in an attempt to stone Him ; but He " hid Himself, and went out of the Temple." After that comes the healing of the man born blind (by means of a wash in the Pool of Siloam), with its interesting sequel leading up to yet further dispute and further division of opinion.

It would be futile to attempt to harmonise the Lucan and Johannine stories in any detailed way. Their mutual independence and at least partial incompatibility are sufficiently obvious. In particular it is hard to recognise in the secret journey of the Fourth Gospel the leisurely and public progress described in Luke. It does not, however, follow that we have not here two versions of one and the

same visit. That the Johannine discourses have no close parallel in Luke occasions us no difficulty, for, as is usual in the Fourth Gospel, these discourses are almost entirely the free composition of the evangelist, not the record or tradition of what had actually been said. For the rest, there are a number of points of contact, which vary in significance, and may be in part fortuitous, but are in any case worth bringing together. First we may note that the proportionate space devoted in both Gospels to the antepenultimate and penultimate visits of Jesus to Jerusalem is approximately the same : in each Gospel the latter gets a little less than one-third the space of the former. The only places where Siloam happens to be mentioned in the Gospels fall in the two narratives of the former. The one "Johannine" passage in Q—that, namely, in which Jesus speaks of His unique intimacy with God—occurs in Luke almost immediately before the arrival at Bethany. Common, further, to the Lucan and Johannine stories are the general atmosphere of hostility and controversy and the allusions to present and imminent persecution (Luke xi. 4b, 15 ff., 47–51, 53 f., xii. 1, 4–9, 11 f., 49–53 ; John vii. 7b, 13, 25, 30, 44, viii. 28, 37, 40, 59, ix. 22). When due allowance is made for the natural and inevitable fragmentariness of all our Gospel-narratives, there is nothing in the Johannine *story* of this visit, except the alleged secrecy of the journey, which conflicts badly with the Lucan account.

But, however much or little of the Fourth Gospel it may prove possible to salve for the genuine history of this episode in Jesus' life, our main source of information must, of course, always be the narrative of the Synoptist. Apart altogether from points of contact with John, there is much in the Lucan section to suggest Jerusalem as the scene of action. As the force of the argument is here cumulative, it is worth while putting the several indications together.

In x. 25–28, the conversation with the lawyer, we have the Lucan parallel to Mark. xii. 28–34=Matthew xxii. 34–40, where Jesus speaks *in Jerusalem* about the two greatest commandments. In x. 30 He speaks of the road "from Jerusalem to Jericho"; in x. 38 He reaches "a certain village" (which may be a deliberate substitute for Bethany —the place almost certainly in Luke's mind); in xi. 1 He is at prayer "in a certain place" (perhaps a substitute for the mount of Olives); in xi. 4 He tells the disciples to pray that they may not be led into *πειρασμός*—surely a hint of approaching conflict and strain (cf. xxii. 28, 40, 46). In xi. 15 ff. we have the passionate Beelzebub-controversy, which—as one scholar graphically says—"smacks of Jerusalem," and which Mark (iii. 22) may be as wrong in locating in Galilee as he is in putting it too early in the story.[1] Later in the chapter come those vehement denunciations of the Pharisees and lawyers, the Marcan and Matthæan parallels to which belong to the story of the last days of Jesus *in Jerusalem*. xii. 1–48 contains little that points definitely to Jerusalem, unless we may include as such the warnings of approaching persecution (1, 4–9, 11 f.) and the allusion to the grandeur of Solomon (27). With xii. 49, however, begins a little series of utterances, forming a closely knit unity, and containing unmistakable signs of having been spoken in the capital. The Galilæans slain at their sacrifices, the accident at Siloam, and "all the men that dwell in Jerusalem," combine in suggesting the same locality. The parable of the barren fig-tree is paralleled in the other Synoptics by the story of the cursing of an actual fig-tree just outside the city-walls (Mark xi. 12–14, 20–25, and parallel).

But the signs of a Jerusalemite setting for this section do not all lie in matters of detail. Its general purport points in the same direction. The thread that links to-

[1] See above, p. 180.

gether the several sayings (xii. 49–xiii. 9), which are at first sight apparently so disconnected, is Jesus' sense of the peril which the nation at large was incurring through its virtual rejection of Himself as its leader. With their refusal of that distinctive ethic which Jesus insisted upon in His teaching, there vanished the one hope of curing the Jewish nationalist hostility to Rome and so of averting the eventual outbreak of a bloody struggle with Cæsar. One frequently meets in early Christian literature with the statement that the disaster which overwhelmed the Jewish nation in 70 A.D. was a punishment Divinely inflicted on them for their wickedness in rejecting and crucifying Jesus. So expressed, the idea, however gratifying to Christian pride, was a crude one, and assumes a deeper knowledge than we possess of the ultimate relations between the will and providence of God on the one hand, and, on the other, the operation of the laws of cause and effect and man's exercise of free-will in his treatment of his fellows. The crudity arose because the psychological causes were ignored. If due account be taken of them, the connexion becomes clearer. Whether the disaster of 70 A.D. ought to be called a Divine punishment or not, it certainly was the natural consequence of the Jewish revolt, which was itself the natural consequence of the Jews' refusal to adopt, at the invitation of Jesus, the distinctively Christian ethic of forgiveness, love, and goodwill. It has been increasingly emphasized by recent writers that, contrary to the opinion of most earlier interpreters of the Gospels, Jesus did not regard the great international problem of His time and country as outside His own concern. The Messiahship, of which He was conscious from the time of His baptism onwards, was a distinctively *national* rôle : different people might conceive of it as taking many different forms, but all agreed that it had reference to *the nation*. And Jesus certainly hoped at the outset that the nation would accept

Him as its leader.[1] Proof of this may be seen in His later words of evident disappointment (Matt. xxiii. 37–39 and parallel; Luke xix. 41–44, etc), and His frequent use of the term "brother" (i.e. fellow-Jew) as equivalent to "fellow-disciple" and of "Gentile" as equivalent to "outsider" (e.g. Matt. v. 47 [vii. 6?], x. 5 f., xviii. 15–17). Here then was one conscious of being called to a national rôle, determined to fulfil that rôle, and hopeful at first of doing so with success. Is it conceivable that such a one should have had nothing to say on the most burning national question His fellow-countrymen had to face, no policy to advocate in regard to the most pressing political question of His time and nation? These considerations suffice to show how utterly inadequate for the interpretation of this side of His work are the old formulæ that He did not come to found a 'worldly' or 'political' kingdom, that He "accepted the State," and that in general He took little or no interest in political questions. They throw a new light on the Temptation-story and on Matthew v. 38–48, where the word for "enemies" holds good for national as well as private foes, and the picture of one being "compelled" to go a mile strongly suggests the overbearing conduct of a foreign official.[2]

[1] Cf. R. Mackintosh, *Historic Theories of Atonement*, pp. 42–46.

[2] Matt. v. 41. The word used for "compel" (ἀγγαρεύσει) is the technical term for forced labour exacted by the State: for a case of it, see Mark xv. 21.

Jesus' own application of His distinctive ethic to the political problem of His fellow-countrymen's antipathy to their foreign rulers has been attracting more and more attention lately. See S. Liberty, *The Political Relations of Christ's Ministry* (1916), J. R. Coates, *The Christ of Revolution* (1920), pp. 1–16, etc., Lily Dougall on "The Salvation of the Nations" in *The Hibbert Journal*, Oct. 1921, pp. 113–123, and in *The Lord of Thought*, pp. 120–122, 136–153, 177; A. T. Cadoux, *Essays in Christian Thinking* (1922), pp. 105–125, 138 f.; V. G. Simkhovitch, *Towards the Understanding of Jesus* (1923), esp. pp. 11, 28, 37, 41, 47 f., 60, 73; E. Grubb in *Expository Times*, Feb. 1923, pp. 214–217. Cf. H. Weinel, *Die Stellung des Urchristentums zum Staat* [1908], p. 9: "Sein ganzes Leben ist ein Kampf mit der politischen Frage seines Volkes gewesen, und er hat mit seinem Leben seine Stellung bezahlt."

As the hostility of the national leaders stiffened with the progress of Jesus' public work, the likelihood of a terrific national catastrophe naturally grew greater. Hence the note of urgency perceptible at so many points in the story, and in particular in the Lucan story of this visit to Jerusalem, which occurred at a rather advanced stage in the ministry. We may well gather from the woes pronounced over Khorazin, Bethsaida, and Kapharnaum (x. 13–15), that such a sense of urgency lay behind the despatch of the Seventy. But in any case it is the prime concern of xii. 54–xiii. 9. Jesus has just been speaking to the disciples with deep emotion about His approaching martyrdom (xii. 49 f.). Conscious, not only of the dissension and persecution consequent on men's rejection of Him (52–53), but also of the national calamity that will follow it (49, 51),[1] He next utters a series of appeals to the public. First He refers them to their normal skill in reading the signs of the weather: why can they not use the same skill in reading the threatening signs of the time (xii. 54–56)? The storm-clouds of war are rolling up on the distant horizon; yet men are blind to them, and will not see for themselves the right path of reconciliation (57).[2] Then follows the injunction to settle a quarrel without delay, lest the enemy, by a prompt appeal to the rigour of the law, foreclose all chance of reconciliation, and exact his full legal due (58).[3] Next Jesus is told of the Galilæans

[1] Vide Matt. x. 34 f. for Q's probable original reading. The apparently final or purposive meaning of the infinitives in these verses must not be pressed: the infinitive can be used to express mere result, and the distinction between mere result and purpose is not sharply drawn, especially in the Semitic mind (cf. A. T. Robertson, *Grammar of Greek N. T.*, pp. 1001–1003, 1089–1091).

[2] Cf. Simkhovitch, *op. cit.* p. 11; Deissmann, *Licht vom Osten* (1923), pp. 93 f.

[3] 'Matthew' has the passage (v. 25 f.) in a setting which suggests a purely personal reference. The general superiority of Luke's arrangement and the excellent sense it here gives make it probable that this sense is the one which the passage originally bore.

martyred by Pilate (xiii. 1). Nothing else is known of the incident: but it is more than likely that the victims suffered as a consequence of some manifestation of patriotism on their part, which was offensive to the Roman power, and that Jesus' informants hoped that the outrage might sting Him into a true Messianic vigour after the pattern of the Maccabees.[1] But Jesus in reply, while dismissing the suggestion that the slaughtered men were more sinful than the other Galilæans, urged that a similar fate overhung all His hearers, unless there should intervene a national change of heart and mind, such as would obviate a violent struggle with Rome. And He reinforced His plea by repeating it with reference to the men who were killed by the fall of a tower at Siloam (xiii. 2–5). Lastly He spoke the parable of the barren fig-tree. The parable is peculiar to Luke; and he omits the story of Mark and Matthew about Jesus having cursed and withered a real fig-tree. That story has difficulties of its own, both scientific and moral; and it would in some ways be a relief if we could regard it as a garbled version of the parable. However that may be, the parable at all events is genuine. We must not try to interpret it in detail, like an allegory: it sets forth one point only—the imminence of destruction, calling urgently for immediate amendment in the last brief remaining interval.[2]

I do not know whether the interrelation of the several

[1] "In all pre-Christian documents, the chief function of the Messiah is the overthrow of the oppressors, the crushing of the ungodly powers" (Simkhovitch, *op. cit.*, p. 34).

[2] Later and more acute stages in this agonising concern of Jesus are seen in Luke xvii. 26–37, *xix. 41–44*, xx. 9–18, 21–25, xxi. 5–28 (Simkhovitch, *op. cit.*, p. 39), *xxiii. 27–31.* (Simkhovitch, p. 42). The passages in italics have no Synoptic parallel. The great lamentation, "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem" (Luke xiii. 34–35=Matt. xxiii. 37–39), seems to be out of its proper chronological place in both Gospels. The precise meaning of its closing words is obscure; but the best place for it would be at the close of Jesus' last visit to Jerusalem but one,

subsections comprised in the passage Luke xii. 49–xiii. 9, and their united reference to the national peril consequent upon the Jewish rejection of Jesus and His teaching, has been observed before. If the view here advocated in regard to this passage be accepted, it confirms our faith in the general superiority of Luke's arrangement, and strengthens very considerably the theory (suggested by numerous less striking touches) that the Great Interpolation conceals within itself the story of at least one, and in all probability two, visits of Jesus to Jerusalem prior to the last visit at which He suffered.

C. J. Cadoux.

SOME INTERESTING READINGS IN THE WASHINGTON CODEX OF THE GOSPELS.

In 1912 Professor Alexander Souter wrote in his excellent handbook, *The Text and Canon of the New Testament* (p. 31), concerning the newly discovered "Freer Gospels," bought in Egypt by Mr. C. L. Freer of Detroit and now in Washington (hence called W by Gregory): "to this MS. one can merely call attention, as at the moment of writing very little is known about it." But in that same year Professor H. A. Sanders, of the University of Michigan, published a *Fascimile of the Washington MS. of the Four Gospels in the Freer Collection* (pp. x. 372), and issued at the same time *The Washington MS. of the Four Gospels* (pp. vii. 247), an elaborate discussion and collation of W. He has presented the essential facts, so far as known, concerning the history of the document. It belongs either to the fourth or to the fifth century, as is plain from the style, uncial writing, infrequent punctuation, absence of accents and of the Eusebian sections, etc. The Gospels appear in the Western order like that in D and the Old Latin

(a, b, e, f, ff^2), i.e., Matthew, John, Luke, Mark. But Sanders devotes most of the space in the latter volume to a discussion of the problem of the text, arguing against the textual theory of Westcott and Hort and in favour of Von Soden's text. "A comparison of the readings of W with Von Soden's results, as shown in his prolegomena, convinced me that Tischendorf and Westcott and Hort had built on a false foundation" (p. 41). Now there is no connexion at all between the theory of Tischendorf and that of Westcott and Hort. But Sanders definitely takes Hoskier's side in his attack (*Codex B and its Allies*, 1914) on Westcott and Hort. He has accepted the classification of documents given by Von Soden, so that his exposition of the critical data found in W is vitiated for most modern students.

Professor E. J. Goodspeed, of the University of Chicago, is a disciple of Westcott and Hort. He published in 1914 *The Freer Gospels*, in which he carefully collates all the important readings. "It will be understood that our basis of collation is the full, continuous text of Westcott-Hort" (p. 7). He has a few pertinent remarks in closing. "In type of text W is curiously heterogeneous, showing three somewhat distinct strata, Neutral, Western, Syrian. Matthew and Luke viii.–xxiv. are decidedly Syrian in type. John and Mark i.–vii. are Neutral, with some interesting Western readings interspersed, e.g., the omission of the Lucan genealogy. The primitive subscription *κατα Ιωαννην* is a further hint of the Neutral ancestry of his part of the MS. Mark is decidedly Western throughout, and while its readings are often not those of D they are usually of the same general kind as they, and so illustrate Hort's feeling that the Western is as much a textual tendency as a definite textual type" (p. 64). The temper of this comment suits me far better than the interpretation of Pro-

fessor Sanders. I do not maintain that Hort said the last word in textual criticism, but nothing has yet been brought to light that shows he was on the wrong tack. There is need of a full, fresh study of W by an adherent of Hort.

One has in W a text of the Gospels copied by a fourth or fifth century scribe, and corrected by himself and three later hands. But in spite of these efforts to remove errors, many remain, like the repetition of John vi. 54*b*, 56*a* after *πίνων μου τὸ αἷμα* in verse 56, a clear case of homoioteleuton. It seems clear that the scribe of W did not copy one single manuscript, however. This codex is a splendid illustration of mixture, as Hort expounded it. The scribe either had access to a number of documents with different ancestries, or the manuscript (if only one) used by him had a diverse ancestry.

For myself I am prepared to argue that W shows Alexandrian readings as well as Neutral, Western, and Syrian. Thus in Matthew i. 25 the Neutral class (א B 2, 33) with some Western support (a^{vid} b c g′ k sah cop syr^{sin} syr^{cur} Am b) reads *υἱόν*, while the Alexandrian (CLΔW) and Syrian (EKMS al pler syr^{utr} Egypt) with some Western support (D f ff^{1} g^{2} arm Eth Aug) read *τὸν υἱὸν αὐτῆς τὸν πρωτότοκον*. In this instance, to be sure, W may be Western or Syrian instead of Alexandrian, but the Alexandrian class is here.

In Matthew v. 22, *εἰκῇ* is properly rejected again by the Neutral class (א B vg Or) and added by the Western, Alexandrian (LΔW cop), and Syrian, including Syr^{sin} (Western) and W. In Matthew vi. 1 the Neutral (א B 1, 209, al Or) and Western (D it vg Hil. Aug. Hier.) classes read rightly *δικαιοσύνην*, while the Alexandrian (WLΔ) and Syrian (EKMSUZ al pler syr^{p} go arm al Chrys) read *ἐλεημοσύνην* with f, k of the Old Latin, and א^{a} syr^{cur} have the colourless *δόσιν*. In Matthew vi. 4 and 6 *ἐν*

τῷ φανερῷ is rightly rejected by the Western and Neutral classes, while it is added by the Alexandrian (WLΔ) and Syrian. The doxology in Matthew vi. 13 is rejected by the Neutral (ℵB 1, 17, 118, 130, 209, cop Or) and Western (D a b c ff^{1} g^{2} l vg Cyp Tert), but appears in the Alexandrian (WLΔ) and Syrian (late documents), with some Western support, though K syr^{cur} and sah all have different shorter forms of it. In Matthew ix. 13, again, W joins the Neutral (ℵBWΔ 1, 22, 33, 118, 209, syr^{utr}) and Western (D most Old Latin, vg arm Eth Aug) against the addition of εἰς μετάνοιαν, which is inserted from Luke v. 32 by the Alexandrian (CL sah cop) and Syrian classes. In Matthew xiv. 15 W goes with the Neutral, Western and Syrian classes against the addition of οὖν by the Alexandrian (ℵCZ cop Or). Classification is difficult at Matthew xix. 16, for σχῶ is read by Neutral documents like BDC, ἔχω by Alexandrian (WΔ) and Syrian, while ℵL 28, 33, 77, 157, 238, syr^{cur} cop have κληρονομήσω, which seems Western in spite of the absence of D (with B). In Matthew xxi. 44. W accompanies the Western class in omitting the addition. In Matthew xxiv. 36 the Neutral and Western classes have οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός, as in Mark xiii. 32, while the Alexandrian (WLΔ cop) and Syrian reject it with syr^{sin}. In Matthew xxvii. 49 W goes with the Western and Syrian classes in rejecting properly the addition from John xix. 34, though this obvious insertion is supported by the Neutral class. One pauses here for a moment to wonder if the Alexandrian class is represented by CL with the Neutral or by WΔ cop Or with the Western and Syrian. It is one of Hort's Western non-interpolations (in other words Neutral interpolations).

In John i. 18, W reads υἱός, not θεός, agreeing with the Western and Syrian classes against the Neutral and Alexandrian. In John v. 1 W follows the Neutral and Western

in reading *ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων* against the Alexandrian *ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰωδαίων*, while in iv. 44 it gives *τῶν Ἰουδαίων* instead of the Western and Syrian *τῆς Γαλιλαίας* or the Neutral and Alexandrian *τῆς Ἰουδαίας*, an evident effort to evade the question whether "Judæa" included Galilee. In John v. 3 W agrees with the Western and Syrian classes in reading *ἐκδεχομένων τὴν τοῦ ὕδατος κίνησιν*. In v. 4 it is with the Neutral and Western in rejecting the whole verse about the periodic visit of the angel to the pool, which is inserted by the Alexandrian and Syrian classes, with some early Western documents (e of the African Latin). In vii. 8 W reads *οὔπω* with the Neutral, Alexandrian (BLWTΔ f g q sah), and Syrian (ΓΛ al pler syr$^{sch\ et\ p}$), against the Western *οὐκ*. But it is more probable that the Western here is right. W joins the Neutral and Alexandrian classes in rejecting the Pericope Adulteræ (John vii. 53–viii. 11), and in xiii. 2 it sides with the Neutral in reading *γινομένου* instead of *γενομένου*. In John xvi. 24, instead of *ἵνα ᾖ πεπληρωμένη*, W has the curious reading *ἵνα πεπληρωμένη ᾖν*. This use of *ᾖν* may be a mere lapse of the scribe or it may represent the irrational *ν* which is so common in the papyri, in which case it would be meant for a subjunctive after all.

In Luke ii. 14 W lines up with the Neutral and Western classes for *εὐδοκίας*, against the Alexandrian and Syrian correction *εὐδοκία*. As we have said, the genealogy of iii. 23–39 is absent from W. In v. 26 W goes with the Western class in omitting the first half of the verse, while in vi. 1 it sides with the Neutral and Alexandrian in rejecting the unintelligible *δευτεροπρώτῳ* which is supported by the Western and Syrian. In Luke viii. 43 W agrees with B in inserting *ἰατροῖς προσαναλώσασα ὅλον τὸν βίον* (cf. Mark v. 26), and in x. 42 it reads *ἑνὸς δέ ἐστιν χρεία* with the Western, Alexandrian, and Syrian classes against

the Neutral (conflate) *ὀλίγων δέ ἐστιν χρεία ἢ ἑνός* (38 arm syr^{hkl} read *ὀλίγων δέ ἐστιν χρεία*). As often, the Western documents are divided here. In xv. 21 W omits *ποιήσόν με ὡς ἕνα τῶν μισθίων σου*, with the Western, Alexandrian, and Syrian, against the neutral interpolation; in xv. 24 W seems to stand alone, however, in omitting *ἦν ἀπολωλὸς καὶ εὑρέθη*. In Luke xxiii. 34 W joins B Δ 38, 435, a b d cop syr^{sin} in omitting the beautiful saying. Is this the combination of the Neutral text and the Western? If so, the verse will have to go. But there is strong Western testimony (African Latin e and syr^{cur} besides c f ff^2 L vg) besides the Alexandrian and Syrian. And what if B itself is Western here? In Luke xxiii. 45 W goes with the Western and the Syrian classes in reading *καὶ ἐσκοτίσθη ὁ ἥλιος* instead of *τοῦ ἡλίου ἐκλιπόντος* (Neutral and Alexandrian), and in xxiv. 53 it follows the Syrian in reading *αἰνοῦντες καὶ εὐλογοῦντες*, the conflate reading which combines the Neutral and Alexandrian *εὐλογοῦντες* and the Western *αἰνοῦντες*.

In Mark i. 1 W has *υἱοῦ θεοῦ* with the Neutral, Western, and Syrian classes; in i. 2 it reads *ἐν τοῖς προφήταις* with the Syrian against the pre-Syrian *ἐν τῷ Ἡσαΐᾳ τῷ προφήτῃ*. In i. 3 W along with the Old Latin inserts what is in Luke iii. 5, 6 and Isaiah xl. 4, 5. In Mark there are also frequent minor omissions and frequent transpositions (as in all the Gospels). In vii. 4 W reads *βαπτίσωνται* with the Western and Syrian texts against the Alexandrian (LΔ) *βαπτίζωνται* and the Neutral *ῥαντίσωνται*. In xiii. 2 W goes with the Western class in adding *καὶ διὰ τριῶν ἡμερῶν ἄλλος ἀναστήσεται ἄνευ χειρῶν*. But the distinctive addition in Mark is at the end of xvi. 14, where W, giving the long ending (so Western, Alexandrian, and Syrian), presents this strange apocryphal addition which had been only indirectly known before:

κἀκεῖνοι ἀπελογοῦντε λέγοντες ὅτι ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος τῆς ἀνομίας καὶ τῆς ἀπιστίας ὑπὸ τὸν σατανᾶν ἐστιν ὁ μὴ ἐῶν τὰ ὑπὸ τῶν πνευμάτων ἀκάθαρτα τὴν ἀλήθειαν τοῦ θεοῦ καταλαβέσθαι δύναμιν. διὰ τοῦτο ἀποκάλυψόν σου τὴν δικαιοσύνην ἤδη· ἐκεῖνοι ἔλεγον τῷ Χριστῷ. καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἐκείνοις προσέλεγεν ὅτι πεπλήρωται ὁ ὅρος τῶν ἐτῶν τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ σατανᾶ ἀλλὰ ἐγγίζει δινὰ καὶ ὑπὲρ ὧν ἐγὼ ἁμαρτησάντων παρεδόθην εἰς θάνατον ἵνα ὑποστρέψωσιν εἰς τὴν ἀλήθειαν καὶ μηκέτι ἁμαρτήσωσιν· ἵνα τὴν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ πνευματικὴν καὶ ἄφθαρτον τῆς δικαιοσύνης δόξαν κληρονομήσωσιν.

It is certain that this addition was no part of the long ending of Mark as probably written by Ariston (the Aristion of Papias) to complete the Gospel.

From this rapid survey of some important readings in W it is plain that mixture is its chief characteristic. Early as it undoubtedly is, it does not rank with ℵ or B. It is more like A in its mixed character. But it will repay careful study precisely because of the complex character of the text which it contains. We can no longer condemn a reading because it is Western. The Western class has various strata in it, and is anything but homogeneous. If the Neutral class is a revision, the Western has a conglomeration of readings in the various documents that preserve it.

A. T. Robertson.

LITERARY ILLUSTRATIONS OF THE FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

II

v. 1. *It is reported commonly that there is fornication among you.*

In his Memoirs for 1708, speaking of the parish of Ettrick, the Rev. Thomas Boston writes: "Meanwhile Satan raged in stirring up to the sin of uncleanness; so that, by the spring 1709, besides several fornications, there were two adulteries in the parish

discovered; and I had heavy work with both. These things often made me look, with a sorrowful heart, on the congregation, as in the case of the Church of Corinth, burnt up with the fire of division and drenched in fleshly abominations."

v. 2. *And ye are puffed up, and have not rather mourned.*

"I never wonder to see men wicked," said Swift, "but I often wonder to see them not ashamed."

v. 6. *Your glorying is not good.*

"No mere mortal has a right
To carry that exalted air;
Best people are not angels quite."

Browning, *Pippa Passes.*

v. 6. *Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump?*

"It is the little rift within the lute,
That by and by will make the music mute,
And ever widening slowly silence all.

The little rift within the lover's lute,
Or little pitted speck in garner'd fruit,
That rotting inward slowly moulders all."

Tennyson, *Merlin and Vivien.*

v. 9–10. *I wrote unto you in an epistle not to company with fornicators: yet not altogether with the fornicators of this world, or with the covetous, or extortioners, or with idolaters; for then ye must needs go out of the world.*

Bunyan, in *The Pilgrim's Progress*, says of Vanity Fair, "The way to the celestial city lies just through this Town, where this lusty fair is kept; and he that will go to the city and yet not go through this Town must needs go out of the world."

v. 11. *Now I have written to you not to keep company, if any man that is called a brother be a fornicator or covetous or an idolater or a railer or a drunkard or an extortioner; with such an one no not to eat.*

In *Fors Clavigera* (xlix.) Ruskin says, suppose that the bishops "only obeyed St. Paul's plain order in 1 Cor. v. 11. Let them determine as distinctly what covetousness and extortion are in the rich, as what drunkenness is, in the poor. Let them refuse,

themselves, and order their clergy to refuse, to go out to dine with such persons; and still more positively to allow such persons to sup at God's table. And they would soon know what fighting wolves meant; and something more of their own pastoral duty than they learned in that Consecration Service where they proceeded to follow the example of the Apostles in Prayer but carefully left out the Fasting."

"If," says Herbert Spencer in his essay on the Morals of Trade, "after listening to a sermon that has by implication denounced the dishonesties he has been guilty of, the rich ill-doer finds, on leaving church, that his neighbours cap to him, does not this tacit approval go far to neutralise the effect of all he has heard? The truth is that with the great majority of men, the visible expression of social opinion is far the most efficient of incentives and restraints."

vi. 5. *I speak to your shame.*

"Where there is yet shame, there may in time be virtue."
Johnson, *A Journey to the Hebrides.*

vi. 6, 7. *Brother goeth to law with brother, and that before the unbelievers. Now therefore there is utterly a fault among you, because ye go to law one with another. Why do ye not rather take wrong?*

In his biography of *James Gilmour of Mongolia* (pp. 217 f.), Lovett quotes Gilmour's description of an incident at Ta Chêng Tzû, in August, 1888. "I found that one of the Christians had possessed himself of my bank book and drawn about fifteen taels of my money which I had banked at the grocer's. The delinquent turned up next day, walked in, and hung up his whip as if nothing had happened. At the moment I was dining, and he sat down beside me. I asked him quietly why he had treated me so. He said I might be easy in mind; he had money and cattle, he would pay me. 'Go then, and bring me the money; till you do so, don't come to me again.' Off he went. Days passed and nothing was done to repair the mischief. Meantime the scandal was the talk of the small town, and the scornful things said were so keen that Liu, my assistant, got quite wild. He was indignant that I did not go to law with the man . . . and even threatened to go home to Shantung if I would do nothing but pray—a course of action on my part which irritated

him much. Li San, the head Christian there, joined him in saying I ought to make a show of power. . . . Finally the offender sent an embassy desiring peace, and, the day before we left, a respectable deputation of neutral friends, Christian and heathen, found its way one by one to my room, coming thus not to attract attention, and last of all came the thief. According to pre-arrangement I asked him, as he entered, what he had come for. He walked up to the wall, knelt down, and confessed his sin in prayer to God."

vi. 11. *And such were some of you ; but ye are washed, but ye are sanctified.*

"We are thankful we get the worst people on earth here. We have had hundreds of converts here who were such outcasts that the dogs would bark at them on the streets. With no other purpose but to see if they could get a night's lodging or a bite to eat, they came here, and here Jesus met them and saved them by His grace, and they are now taking care of their families—fine strong Christian men, members of the churches, and a blessing to all who knew them, when a few years ago they were an unmitigated curse to society."

S. H. Hadley, *Down in Water Street*, p. 702.

"When we first landed here, the natives lived only to fight, and the victory was celebrated by a cannibal feast. . . . All these things are changed, or are in process of change. For several years there have been no cannibal ovens, no desire for skulls. Tribes that could not formerly meet but to fight, now meet as friends, and sit side by side in the same house, worshipping the true God. Men and women, who on the arrival of the mission, sought the missionaries' lives, are only anxious now to do what they can to assist them. How the change came about is simply by the use of the same means as those acted upon in many islands in the Pacific. The first missionaries landed not only to preach the Gospel of Divine Love but also to live it, and to show to the savage a more excellent way than theirs."

J. Chalmers, *Pioneer Life and Work in New Guinea*, p. 62.

vi. 13. *Now the body is not for fornication but for the Lord, and the Lord for the body.*

"Having had the doctrine of Holy Scripture unfolding those

chaste and high mysteries, with timeliest care infused, that 'the body is for the Lord, and the Lord for the body'; thus also I argued to myself that if unchastity in a woman, whom St. Paul terms the glory of man, be such a scandal and dishonour, then certainly in a man, who is both the image and the glory of God, it must, though commonly not so thought, be much more deflouring and dishonourable; in that he sins both against his own body, which is the perfecter sex, and his own glory, which is in the woman; and, that which is worst, against the image and glory of God, which is in himself."

Milton, in *An Apology for Smectymnuus.*

vi. 19, 20. *Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost, which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye are not your own? For ye are bought with a price: therefore, glorify God in your body, and in your spirit, which are God's.*

"Manhood is most properly manifested in the mastery of impulse. God is at once the author and moving force of our animal impulses, and of the dictate of reason which bids us control them. He supplies us with the task, and with the instrument by which it is to be accomplished . . . Now what is true of all controllable impulses is more emphatically true of that which is chief among them, in so far as it concerns that animal function whose results are of the greatest moment both to individual and social life—namely, the multiplying of human beings, the bringing of new personalities on to the stage of human life. If it is a momentous thing for any man to usurp the authority of God and by the crime of murder to cut short the allotted space of a human life, surely the 'to be or not to be' of unborn personalities is a question of great consequence, when it behoves a man, with whom its decision rests, to be fully master of himself. If it is bestial that he should be so enslaved by greediness as to endanger his own health, what can be said of his slavery to an appetite fraught with so much more consequence to others?"

Father Tyrrell, *Hard Sayings*, (pp. 201 f.).

"Deep at the bottom of all our sense of uncleanness, of dirt, is the feeling, primitive, irresolvable, universal, of the sanctity of the body. Nothing in the material sphere can properly be dirty except the body. We speak of a 'dirty road,' but in an uninhabited world moist clay would be no more dirty than hard

rock ; it is the possibility of clay adhering to a foot which makes it mire. A dwelling-place is dirty when it is in a state to communicate defilement to the bodies moving about in it ; a plate is dirty when it may attach unworthy matter to that which, we find, is to enter the holy place. . . . This feeling about the body, no doubt, goes to explain why carnal sins have always seemed 'impure' in a special sense."

Edwyn Bevan, *Hellenism and Christianity*, pp. 154–156.

"In civil life, as in army life, the average man is immoral, both in thought and deed. Let us be frank about this. What a doctor might call the 'appetites' and a padre the 'lusts' of the body, hold dominion over the average man, whether civilian or soldier, unless they are counteracted by a stronger power. The only men who are pure are those who are absorbed in some pursuit, or possessed by a great love ; whether it be the love of clean, wholesome life which is religion, or the love of a noble man which is hero-worship, or the love of a true woman. These are the four powers which are stronger than the 'flesh'—the zest of a quest, religion, hero-worship, and the love of a good woman. If a man is not possessed by one of these he will be immoral."

Donald Hankey, *A Student in Arms* (ch. ii.).

Therefore glorify God.

"'Man's chief end is to glorify God, and to enjoy Him for ever,' repeated Bud reflectively. 'I've got that all right, but what does it mean ?' 'What does it mean ?' said Mr. Dyce, a bit taken aback. 'It means,' said Daniel Dyce the lawyer, seating himself on the sofa beside his niece, 'that a man in himself is a gey poor soul, no' worth a pin, though he's apt to think the world was made for his personal satisfaction. . . . To glorify's to wonder and adore, and who keeps the wondering humble heart, the adoring eye, is to God pleasing exceedingly. Sing, lassie, sing, sing, sing, inside ye, even if ye are as timmer as a cask. To be grateful always, and glad things are no worse, is a good song to start the morning.'"

Neil Munro, *The Daft Days* (ch. vii.).

vii. 12. *To, the rest say I, not the Lord.*

"It cannot but open men's eyes, to see that many controver-

sies do merely pertain to that which is either not revealed or positive ; and that many others do grow upon weak and obscure inferences or derivations : which latter sort, if men would revive the blessed style of that great doctor of the Gentiles, would be carried thus, *ego, non dominus*. . . . But men are now over-ready to usurp the style, *non ego, sed dominus*."

Bacon, *The Advancement of Learning* (ii. 25, 7).

vii. 15. *But if the unbelieving depart, let him depart. A brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases.*

Heber in India had to deal with the case of a native Christian who " six years ago married a woman who then professed herself a Christian, but soon afterwards ran away from him and turned Mussulman, in which profession she was now living with another man. The husband had applied to the magistrate to recover her, but on the woman declaring that she was no Christian, and did not choose to be the wife of one, he said he could not compel her. The husband, in consequence, about two years ago, applied to Mr. Frazer to marry him to another woman. Mr. Frazer declined doing so, as no divorce had taken place, on which he took the woman, without marriage, and had now two children by her. For this he had been repelled from the communion by Mr. Morris, but still continued to frequent the church, and was now very anxious for confirmation. After some thought I came to the conclusion that the man should be reproved for the precipitancy with which he had formed his first connexion, and the scandal which he had since occasioned, but that he might be admitted both to confirmation and the communion, and might be married to the woman who now held the place of a wife to him. It seemed a case to which St. Paul's rule applied, that if an unbelieving husband or wife chose to depart, on religious grounds, from their believing partner, this latter was, in consequence, free."

vii. 20. *Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called.*

" However circumstances may help us or hinder us, the intellectual life is always a contest or a discipline, and the art or skill of living intellectually does not so much consist in surrounding ourselves with what is reputed to be advantageous as in compelling every circumstance and condition of our lives to

yield us some tribute of intellectual benefit and force. The school of the intellectual man is the place where he happens to be."

P. G. Hamerton, *The Intellectual Life* (p. ix.).

"I am for permanence in all things, at the earliest possible moment, and to the latest possible. Blessed is he that continueth where he is. Here let us rest, and lay out seedfields; here let us learn to dwell.... O unwise mortals that forever change and shift, and say, Yonder, not Here! Wealth richer than both the Indies lies everywhere for man, if he will endure. Not his oaks only and his fruit-trees, his very heart roots itself wherein he will abide."

Carlyle, *Past and Present.*

vii. 21. *Art thou called being a servant? care not for it: but if thou mayest be made free, use it rather.*

"There are some, Englishmen unhappily," Dr. Arnold wrote in 1840, "but most unworthy to be so, who affect to talk of freedom, and a citizen's rights and duties, as things about which a Christian should not care. Like all their other doctrines, this comes out of the shallowness of their little minds, 'understanding neither what they say, nor whereof they affirm.' True it is, that St. Paul, expecting that the world was shortly to end, tells a man not to care even if he were in a state of personal slavery. That is an endurable evil which will shortly cease, not in itself only, but in its consequences. But even for the few years during which he supposed the world would exist, he says, 'if thou mayest be made free, use it rather.' For true it is that a great part of the virtues of human nature can scarcely be developed in a state of slavery, whether personal or political. The passive virtues may exist, the active ones suffer."

"Christianity for a long time hid its levelling power in the very excess of an idealism, which treated worldly distinctions indifferent, and *therefore* allowed them to exist. But by treating all such distinctions as accidental differences of outward position which a few years must terminate, and by disregarding them in the order of the church, it spread through all the nations which it reached a consciousness of the infinite value of each individual soul and of the comparative unimportance of the things that in

this world divide man from, or set him above, another. . . . The hyper-idealism of early Christianity refused to question the justice of slavery in private life and of despotism in the State. It declared that the powers that be are ordained of God, without asking how they had been established or how they exercised their authority."

E. Caird, *The Evolution of Religion* (i. 16–17).

vii. 24. *Let every man, wherein he is called, therein abide with God.*

"From every point on earth," says Amiel, "we are equally near to heaven and to the infinite. Do not despise your situation; in it you must act, suffer, and conquer."

vii. 26. *It is good for a man so to be.*

"In the ages since Adam's marriage," says George Eliot in *Felix Holt*, "it has been good for some men to be alone, and for some women also."

vii. 37. *He that . . . hath power over his own will.*

"A good heart is only the wad upon powder, when a violent will is behind it."

R. D. Blackmore, *Cradock Nowell* (ch. lii.).

GNOSTICISM AND LIFE.

"We may, I suppose, say that the questions raised by the study of Gnosticism, and the things akin to it in the ancient world, are those which at the present day probe most searchingly into the fabric of Christian belief. Probably many Theologians even to-day hardly realise the weight of the difficulties which are bearing upon them from that quarter. Gnosticism is a field into which they have never thrown more than perfunctory glances." [1] So writes Mr. Edwyn Bevan, and what he says serves to remind us that the questions raised by Gnosticism are questions—not of a single age—but of every age. What then is Gnosticism?

[1] *Hellenism and Christianity*, p. 89.

It is not a name which can be applied to any single system of thought, whether philosophical or religious. It is rather a name for a group of speculative tendencies—born of a desire to solve the riddle of the universe : to reduce its perplexities to a simple whole—a group of tendencies which may affect any religious or philosophical system. More particularly it is a name which historians give to certain Oriental ways of thinking, which began to influence Western thought and civilisation before the Christian era. As such Gnosticism was born of the *weary hopelessness* which we usually associate with Asia, in contrast with the active optimism of the West. It was typically Eastern but it changed and grew as a result of its contact with the West.

The questions which it raised were connected with God, with this world, and with life—questions which arise in every age, except when crowded out by practical interests and activities ; as has too often been the case in Western civilisation. Such questions are familiar to every student of religion in India to-day, and in a sense to the majority of Hindus whether educated or not.[1] They are once again being introduced into the Western world as a result of our contact with the East. Theosophy is sufficient witness to this ; for in a very real sense it is a modern representative of Gnosticism. How far Christian Science has arisen as a result of Eastern influence it is difficult to say ; but it too, in a very large measure, is akin to early forms of Gnosticism. Popularly it is a healing cult, but fundamentally it is something more. It is based on some of the problems which gave rise to early gnostic movements, and in many cases offers the same solution.

It is not possible here to enter into any full description of the speculative tendencies underlying Gnosticism. It will be sufficient to outline briefly the stages of its influence

[1] See *The Ancient Church and Modern India*, by Godfrey Phillips.

on Western thought, and to sum up its main characteristics, especially in contrast to Christianity, which, in spite of the efforts of men like Irenæus, was undoubtedly coloured by it—perhaps not so much directly as indirectly through Neo-Platonism.

There are three main stages in the influence of Gnosticism on Western thought, and it is difficult to assign chronological order to them. First, Gnosticism influenced Greek thinking to a very marked degree, and finally produced a dominant form of philosophy known as Neo-Platonism. Secondly, to a less degree, it influenced Jewish religion. Judaism was too sane, too firmly based upon a profound respect for the creation, and in particular for human personality, to be influenced to any marked degree; but it can hardly be doubted that the Essenes owed not a little of their religious thinking to contact with Gnostic teachers. Thirdly, Gnosticism influenced Christianity, and this influence was felt in the beginnings of Christianity. This was once doubted, and it was thought that Gnosticism was a definite religion which arose as a sect within the Christian Church during the second century.[1] Such a view is no longer possible. Gnosticism was not a definite religion in itself, but a group of philosophical tendencies, much older than Christianity. When Christianity was spreading westward Gnosticism had begun to influence Western thought. The New Testament shows clearly that Gnosticism had begun to work in the Pauline Churches as early as A.D. 55, when the Apostle wrote his first epistle to the Corinthians. In his later epistles, especially that to Colossæ and the Pastorals; in Hebrews; and in the epistles of John, we have frequent reference to the havoc being wrought by

[1] It was, of course, this mistaken idea which underlay many of the results of the earliest criticism of the New Testament by the Tübingen school, especially the rejection of some of the Pauline epistles and the assigning of a second-century date to the Fourth Gospel.

Gnosticism in the Christian Churches ; and it is not too much to say that unless we know something of this subtle Orientalism, and remember that it forms the historic background of much in the New Testament, we shall fail to understand the writers' messages, especially in their relation to life.

Further, it is possible to trace the influence of Gnosticism on such a non-speculative religion as Mohammedanism. Certainly Mohammedanism did not convert a large tract of India and remain as it was. But above all it must not be forgotten that Gnosticism had, and has to do with life —with activity in this world. And whatever view of life is held by any religious faith, it is just at this point—its directions for using this world—that the religion is changed when it comes in contact with the subtle influences of Gnosticism. Neither must we forget that though Gnostic ideas have their natural home in the East, they may arise on any soil. Professor Gwatkin stressed this point. " What is here called Orientalism is not a local religion, but a permanent tendency of human nature which is well developed in the East, but may show itself anywhere. In early Christian times it was the resultant of complex forces. In addition to widespread superstitions like demon-worship it had a Chaldean element of star-worship, theogonies, charms and soothsayings ; a Syrian element of stern asceticism and gross licentiousness by turns ; an Egyptian element of mystery, of ceremonial, and of looking for judgement to come. All these are plain in sundry of the Gnostic sects, and most of them take a colour from the Greek world around them ; but the deepest influence of all was a Persian element of Dualism, and this is what we shall have to chiefly keep in view." [1]

These various strands of Gnosticism we shall later pass

[1] *Early Church History*, vol. ii, p. 4.

in review, but just here I wish to stress the question of Dualism. Wherever and whenever Gnosticism appears it is bound up with the problem of evil—a problem which even to-day finds no adequate solution. Thus it is bound up with the relation of God to this world—to matter ; and as life consists of the use we make of this world—the material creation—so Gnosticism, wherever it is accepted, profoundly affects living. To whatever dim distant past we trace the Hebrew religion we shall find that it always asserted this one thing—God was righteous and the Creator of both spirit and matter. He was a God of *activity*, not of *passivity*, and His activity resulted in that which was *good*. Not even in creation—in matter as such—was there any evil. The Hebrew religion was perfectly sane in its view of matter, including our own bodies. But *evil* was present in the world, and how was it to be explained ? If God created the world, then was not God responsible for the evil ? Did it not proceed from Him ? The Prophets and later writers show more than traces of the conflict created by this terrible problem. Especially is the book of Job a contribution to its solution. The solutions to this problem are of two kinds : those which despair of this world and in general of created matter, and those which in spite of baffling perplexity retain their faith in a righteous God, and are hopeful about the world order. The solution offered by normal Judaism was of this latter type—optimistic. " Though He slay me yet will I trust Him." [1] Perhaps Ecclesiastes represents the pessimistic type with its " vanity of vanities ; all is vanity and vexation of spirit," yet it is not the extreme pessimism of Buddhism, which makes God refrain from activity and teaches that the one aim is to reach the

[1] Job xiii. 15. But see Peake's Commentary for a different interpretation. If this interpretation be accepted, it does not alter the truth of the general statement.

absolutely passive state—Nirvana. The revelation which came through Israel was—in spite of difficulties in the speculative realm—firm on two points : (1) God had created matter which in itself was good ; (2) in spite of all appearances to the contrary, God was not the author of evil, and in no sense was to be held responsible for the evil which so obviously existed in the created world. Eventually, in spite of tremendous suffering, the righteousness of God would vindicate itself and the world would be saved. Christianity took this much over from Judaism ; and we may admit at once that it was not—nor did it claim to be —a complete solution of the problem of evil. But Gnosticism offered a perfect solution and one which conflicted with these ideas. It was the solution of Persian Dualism : matter in itself was evil, and as such was the creation of a lower deity. Thus God was both *light* and *dark*, *good* and *evil*, and as such, in the higher and lower deities, the author of good (spirit) and evil (matter). Opposed to this we hear the stern words of the New Testament writers : " Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God : for God cannot be tempted with evil, and He Himself tempteth no man," [1] " God is light, and in Him is no darkness at all." [2] And yet how many Christians escape the problem of evil and the baffling inequalities in suffering with which life in this world presents us, by saying that God is tempting men ; and how many regard their own prosperity as a mark of recognition, on God's part, of their faithfulness ? What a travesty of Christianity ! Even the Psalmist knew better, when he realised that the wicked prosper and the righteous too often have to flee.[3] But the leaven of Gnosticism is always at hand to offer us a *simple*, *easy*, and *comforting* way out of the terrible problem

[1] James i. 13. [2] 1 John i. 5.

[3] See also Jeremiah and Habakkuk, who question Yahweh on this point.

of suffering which life reveals—it is the way of pride and self-complacency : anything but the Way of the Cross.

The forms of Gnosticism were many, and its influence was most felt through some of the Mystery-Religions, the chief rivals of Christianity in the Western world. But there were certain characteristics common to all forms of Gnosticism, and a study of these will serve to show how it influenced Christianity, and how it affects Christian thinking to-day —especially in relation to life in this world. This influence of Gnosticism, as far as our New Testament is concerned, is first clearly evidenced in the First Epistle to the Corinthians. Again we find Paul uttering significant warnings against what appears to be a Jewish form of Gnosticism—probably associated with the Essenes or perhaps with disciples of John the Baptist who regarded him as the incarnation of the *logos*—in the Colossian Epistle. That it had begun to make inroads on the Ephesian Church we know from the First Epistle to Timothy, and later at the close of the first century John is concerned to refute it in his first epistle. *Much of the New Testament takes on a new meaning when we realise that it was written to meet an urgent demand created by the tremendous danger that Christianity might be swallowed up in Gnostic theories about the world and life.* In the main the Christianity of the first century escaped this calamity, but there must have been many in the Churches—as the epistles referred to prove—who were guiding their lives by Gnostic principles, rather than following in the Way which was founded on the Truth, and which brought with it the experience of Life eternal, of which Life John is never tired of speaking.

But the battle was not over with the first century. It was a much more serious conflict in the second, and the Christianity which emerged at the beginning of the third century was not without many bruises and deformities—

marks of the struggle. But as Gnosticism is a tendency always present with men—a leaven which works—it is possible for men to-day to look at Christianity through Gnostic eyes and to rule their lives accordingly. Let us look then at some of the characteristics of this system.

(1) Gnosticism was born of a weary hopelessness of the world order. It was *pessimistic* about the world—the material creation. And therefore it sought a way of salvation or redemption. So also did Christianity teach a way of salvation by redemption : and at first sight it might seem that the two were identical. Undoubtedly Christian salvation has often been preached in semi-gnostic terms. The salvation of Gnosticism was salvation *from the world*—the physical material creation including the body : that of Christianity was salvation *from sin*—a very different matter. But are not Christians exhorted to renounce " the world, the flesh, and the devil " ? True ! they are, but it is certain that—in a Gnostic sense—this was no part of the Christian faith. Christianity was not pessimistic about the world in a Gnostic sense. God loved the world and God was reconciling the world to Himself. Christianity was *optimistic* about the creation of God. Paul could speak of " a dispensation of the fulness of the times " which was " to sum up all things in Christ, the things in the heavens and the *things upon the earth.*" [1] Renunciation of the world in an ascetic or puritan sense—speaking of its pleasures and beauties in shocked tones—is something easier than Christianity, which is a *way of life in this world.* As John pointed out to the Gnostic troublers of the Church of his day, Jesus had said, " I pray not that Thou shouldest take them out of the world, but that Thou shouldest keep them from evil." [2]

(2) Gnosticism offered a *complete* solution of the problem

[1] Eph. i. 10. [2] John xvii. 15.

of evil by stating that evil was in matter. Moreover it claimed to solve the dreadful problem of theodicy. Thus it came—in most of its forms—to posit two gods : one the creator of spirit and the other the creator of matter, including our bodies. The material creation was not, to the Gnostic, the medium through which activity might result in evil or in goodness, but was in itself evil. The redemption promised in Gnosticism was a redemption of the spirit (soul) from matter.

But Judaism, from which Christianity sprang, had regarded God as pronouncing the material creation to be *good*, and Jesus had based His teaching upon a profound respect for nature as we know it. And above all the Incarnation was a complete denial of the doctrine that matter, including the body, was evil. The great stumblingblock which Gnosticism found in Christianity, and which it did not find in the Greek religions, was the doctrine of the Incarnation : " the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us." [1] The test by which true Christians were to be recognised from Gnostics, in the days of an itinerant ministry, was that they should " confess that Jesus Christ had *come in the flesh*." [2] To the true Gnostic it was unthinkable that the god of spirit should have any relationship with material creation. No wonder that John says " that which we have heard, that which we have seen with our eyes, that which we beheld, and *our hands handled*." [3] Christianity could have no partnership with the docetic form of Gnosticism which taught that Jesus was visited at His baptism by the Spirit, and forsaken by the same Spirit before His

[1] John i. 14.

[2] 1 John iv. 2. The relationship which I think may quite well exist between the Gospel and the First Epistle is that the latter was sent out as a kind of tract to meet an urgent need, and the former was written with more deliberation to meet the same need.

[3] 1 John i. 1.

death on the Cross, nor with that form which taught that His whole life, including His Crucifixion and death, was but an *appearance*.[1]

How then was the spiritual god of Gnosticism to redeem men from matter, if he could not come in contact with it? This difficulty was overcome by supposing that a whole chain of mediators, angels, keepers of the gates, stretched between God and the world. True! it did not solve the difficulty of eliminating God from all possibility of contact with what is material, but it served to satisfy thousands who sought to cast off evil matter and so reach the Elysium of spirit. The way of Gnosis was entered by *initiation*, and initiation consisted in being made wise as to the mysterious names of the keepers of the gates—the angelic mediators between God and man. Gnostics might boast of their secret knowledge which made them sure of a final admission into the realm of bliss, but, on the other hand, there was the danger that they might forget a single one of the magic names and so after all fail to gain their heaven. We are familiar from Irenæus with many of these gate-keepers. Against all this Christianity claimed that there was only "one mediator between God and man," [2] and its Baptism was "in the name of Jesus." [3] Christians were to name only "the name of Christ," [4] for it was "above every other name," and "neither was there any other name *under heaven* given among men whereby they might be saved." [5] Paul could say to the Colossians that "in Christ all the treasures of wisdom and gnosis were hidden," [6] and again that He was "the Head of all *principality and power*," [7] and so apart from the question as to whether they were

[1] See the *Gospel of Peter* and the *Acts of John*.
[2] 1 Tim. ii. 5.
[3] Acts ii. 38; Acts viii. 16, etc.
[4] Eph. v. 20; Phil. ii. 9; 2 Tim. ii. 19.
[5] Acts iv. 12. [6] Col. ii. 3. [7] Col. ii. 10.

real or not, Gnostic redeemers did not count. Christians were not therefore to "worship angels" or mediators. Writing to Timothy, he had similar advice to give. Certain men were teaching doctrines which had to do with "endless genealogies"[1]—lists of Gnostic redeemers. The situation is more serious and he has no hesitation in calling these things "fables," "old wives' fables," "profane babblings," and "*gnosis* which is falsely so called." What a contrast between the redemption from sin of Christianity, and the redemption from evil matter of Gnosticism! Of the contrast Mr. Bevan aptly says, "Even at first sight the Gospel must have presented in some ways a striking contrast to Hellenistic theology! It must have seemed such a simplification. Instead of the enormous apparatus of mystical words and ceremonial practices, to believe that in order to conquer all possible terrors of the Unknown, the whole range of ghostly enemies, one needed only to know Jesus! It must have been like the lifting off of a burden to say, 'I believe in one God, Maker of heaven and earth.'"[2]

Redemption from matter is the soul of Hinduism to-day, and it meets us again in Theosophy with its many heavens to which correspond the various bodies we are to assume—astral and otherwise. Christian Science gets rid of matter and evil at the same time by regarding them as illusions—non-existent. Historical Christianity has never been so thoroughgoing in its Gnosticism, but in so far as it has taught contempt for the body, and preached a salvation of the *soul*, it has been Gnostic and not Christian. Christianity—the Christianity of the New Testament—has to do with the *body* as well as the soul, with life here and now as well as hereafter, as much with this world as with the world to come. I am quite aware that the advocates of textual theology are ready to furnish any number of texts to prove

[1] 1 Tim. i. 4. [2] *Hellenism and Christianity*, p. 87.

the contrary, but the only method of interpretation which can give us the meaning of the New Testament is the *historical*. Certainly it is more difficult but it more than repays to use it.

Christianity was sane and robust, and it taught a much more difficult thing than renunciation of the world and the flesh : Jesus was the Redeemer of the world and the body was the temple of the Holy Spirit. Christianity called men to a full life—a life of *active* love : of goodness in the midst of evil, and of service to humanity.

W. Robinson.

A CRITICISM OF PESSIMISM.

"Ah, Love ! could thou and I with fate conspire
To grasp this sorry Scheme of Things entire,
Would not we shatter it to bits—and then
Re-mould it nearer to the Heart's Desire."

It would not be difficult for any educated person to compile a most impressive Anthology of Pessimism. One might select passages from every age and from nearly every writer of genius. Contributions could be furnished at once from men so different as Shakespeare, Hardy, Tolstoi and Newman. And those who have felt the deep sincerity that rings through so many of these tremendous utterances will be far from believing that any convincing answer can yet be given. There are facts in the world, making for pessimism, that no serious man will treat lightly. Yet the writer of this paper, along with many other people, has an obstinate conviction, which nothing hitherto has seriously affected, that the simply pessimistic view of the world is not justified by the facts. It may possibly, he will admit, be the fortunate circumstances of his own life that have made him incline to other views, or that

some prejudice formed at an early stage has prevented him from gaining an unbiassed outlook on life, but certainly he has never yet been able to see what to such men as Thomas Hardy is apparently so clear and undeniable. The purpose of this paper is to present some of the facts which have always seemed to him to weigh down the balance on the other side.

One has to recognise to begin with, when considering the brighter and the darker facts of life, that though the world exhibits the most extraordinary and perplexing contradictions, none the less it is a unity. A man with something of the temper of mind that leads to philosophy, by an accident of fortune, such as ill health or bad circumstances or unusual sensitiveness, has his mind turned to certain features of life. It may be the fact of war or the physical and mental and moral degradation so much in evidence in certain places; or it may be facts of nature such as parasitism, or, to take a conspicuous example, the history of Mantis religiosa as narrated by J. H. Fabre. Is it to be wondered at if the consideration of such things forces him to a more or less complete pessimism? If there be a beneficent power having to do with this world why are they permitted? Is it not a sorry scheme of things that allows such facts as these? And yet, without underestimating in any way the force of such considerations, one is bound to reply that nature is a unity, and that as far as can be seen the existence of such things was absolutely necessary if the more worthy things in life were to develop. The tapeworm is merely another product, we may perhaps say a by-product, of the forces that produced Shakespeare and Beethoven and Jeanne d'Arc. It is unscientific to single out anything in nature, even a human action, and describe it unreservedly as bad. The only way in which one is permitted to judge the world is *as a whole.* Would

any of us tamper with the structure of it, if it were possible, knowing the good that might be endangered by our action? Are any of us indeed so certain in our pessimism that if it were in our power we would annihilate it, and thus put an end to nature, and the activities of man, with his books, his pictures, his cathedrals, his laboratories, and his dreams? Logic seems to drive us to that question, and refuse to permit the question to be set in any other form.

And, further, the writer very keenly suspects that if one were to reject this world one might be forced on similar grounds to give one's verdict against any other life under material conditions. It may indeed be life and will and reason in any form that are to be questioned, as apparently Buddha questioned them. Philosophers speak of other possible worlds, but one cannot help wondering whether any other, essentially different, could possibly exist. There may be an answer to this, but the amateur in philosophy has a suspicion that wherever one might go the same laws would hold. It may be replied that we can conceive of a better universe, but can we—in any detail? A universe is a complex thing where all things react on each other, and even with the very limited freedom that we possess in this world we have often to regret our actions when we see their consequences. May there not, indeed, be an inevitability in all law? Could anything different have been done, if anything was to be done at all? May it not be a question of life on such terms, or no life at all? It is surely uncertain.

It will no doubt be agreed, at least, that all that can be done is to judge this world as we know it, and strike a balance between good and evil. But the moment that we attempt to do so we are met by an obvious difficulty. Who can balance the goodness of a St. Paul against the badness of a Domitian, or Hamlet against slavery, or a

sunset against hunger, or the affection of a family against a lingering illness? When the problem is set the impossibility of an absolute solution is apparent. The best that we can do is to observe life as fairly and as completely as possible, and give our personal opinion. Naturally this opinion will in all cases be biassed by our own temper and experience, and largely by our bodily health at the moment that we pretend to decide. It is for this reason that opinions so contradictory have been given, and that from hour to hour many of us incline to one side and then to the other.

There is, however, one consideration that may be urged that would make it appear that a verdict in favour of the world will continue to be given by most men. Happiness seems to be the result of a surplus of strength over the demands made upon us. We are either able to swim in the sea of trouble or we are not. If a man requires ten units of strength to maintain his position, and he possesses eleven, the odd unit seems to mean so much happiness. Dickens' famous illustration of income and expenditure is true in the widest sense. And it is quite arguable, if not indeed certain, that the faculty of happiness is of so great "survival-value" that it is only the races possessing this power that continue to exist. If any species were normally unhappy, and found life barely tolerable, it is unlikely that it would continue to hold its own against others with a greater interest in life. The human race has existed till the present because its resources, bodily and spiritual, have been sufficient, the normal man believing in the value of life, indeed in the vast majority of cases attributing an infinite value to it. There are no doubt many individuals, and possibly certain races, with whom this is not so, because some subjective quality is wanting, or the conditions of life are especially hard, but the very fact that the race of

man continues to exist, and has energy to spare, goes far to prove that for us at least life is normally worth living. It is not a question of the *abstract* good or evil of the world, and indeed no such estimate could be made, even if it were thinkable, but it is simply a question whether for this species or this individual life is to be prized. We might easily pursue this argument further and suggest that a superabundant happiness such as that of the drunkard would be adverse to survival. A change in the atmosphere that raised our spirits beyond a certain point, so as to produce a kind of intoxication, would naturally, one might believe, lead to our speedy extinction. It is probable that a certain degree of happiness, within moderately narrow limits, is what nature approves and tends to produce.

One of the most fundamental reasons why opinions differ is that in our scheme of values we each, from our special characters, attach different degrees of value to the same things. One man values most highly physical efficiency, while another sets the highest value on intellectual or artistic or moral excellence. One could imagine that a Clerk Maxwell would consider that the mathematical attainments of mankind would outweigh a good deal of hunger, and that a Leonardo da Vinci would believe that a universe that makes great art possible can afford to contain a good deal of pain and sin. Those who believe in the absolute and incomparable value of moral goodness will readily enough accept a certain amount of physical suffering and of untruth in the world, especially if it appears that it is only out of such conditions that a high morality could be born. One will accept a large degree of injustice in the scheme of things if he values highly enough the wild and unconquerable spirit that such things create in man. One might suggest that the creation of such a work as *Tess of the D'Urbervilles* is a sufficient answer to the curious type of pessimism preached in that book, and

that the writings of Anatole France are a powerful support to a sober optimism, quite sufficient to correct his underlying arguments.

The writer will admit, on the other hand, that he is not convinced, as most optimists and meliorists appear to be, that happiness and goodness are certainly increasing and will certainly increase, till the conditions of life are fundamentally changed, and an optimistic verdict the only possible one to a sane man. An argument can be made that this is so, and certainly some of the more ideal things do tend to increase and strengthen their position in the world. But as one reads ancient history and literature one can hardly help at times a suspicion that life is always much the same, and open to much the same conflicting judgments. It is for that reason that we can read seriously the Greek drama and the Jewish psalms. In face of the events of our lifetime it is at least not an obvious fact that there is a much greater measure of goodness and happiness in the world than there was three thousand years ago. And when things do improve we raise our standards and demand more, so that the pressure of life is always much the same. No doubt if we compare ourselves with primitive man a very great advance is apparent, but it is possible that as our height reaches a certain point, and our physical strength, and no further advance is made, so mentally, and in some respects morally, a certain height is reached and not easily surpassed. Would Socrates have been reduced to silence or submission in a conversation with William James or Henri Bergson? Would Praxiteles be impressed by a modern exhibition of art, or feel, indeed, that he had learnt anything worth learning? Would a Christian congregation of the first century compare unfavourably with a congregation of to-day in Glasgow or Aberdeen? It is at least open to doubt. It would seem that the advance will continue to come rather

in the making of new instruments, and in the creating of a more reasonable system of common life and in the abandonment of false philosophies than from any definite change in human nature. But a belief in an indefinite improvement of things is certainly not essential that one may readily and gladly accept life. To believe that life is worth living in most cases and that it could be made so in nearly all by a change in our own attitude to it, and to believe also that there is some possibility of improvement, is surely an adequate working faith, and extraordinarily like the normal human conviction about this strangest of all possible worlds.

JOHN MORELL MCWILLIAM.

NOTES AND NOTICES OF RECENT CRITICISM.

THE EGYPTIAN BOOK OF PROVERBS.

AN Egyptian collection of moralistic sayings, "The Teaching of Amen-em-ope" was published by Dr. Wallis Budge in his second series of *Egyptian Hieratic Papyri in the British Museum* (London, 1923), and Dr. Adolf Erman has reprinted an essay upon it called *Eine ägyptische Quelle der Sprüche Salomos* (1924), which, as the title suggests, is based upon the theory that this Egyptian manual was known to the authors or compiler of the Hebrew Proverbs. The occasional resemblances between the two have been noticed by all critics of the document. Sometimes they are striking. But Erman goes the length of holding that the resemblances are not accidental; the Egyptian manual may have been written as early as c. 1000 B.C., while long afterwards an Egyptian Jew employed and translated it, the traces appearing in Proverbs xxii. 17–xxiv. 22. Gressmann prints an exhaustive comparison of the two texts in the *Zeitschrift für die alttest. Wissenschaft* (1924, pp. 272–296), with some extremely acute criticisms of Erman and a general discussion of the book of Proverbs. The first really striking parallel is to xxii. 20. The Egyptian manual has "Consider these thirty chapters";

this may support the reading שְׁלֹשִׁים in xxii. 20. It is true that no noun follows "thirty," but Gressmann points out that a noun like "proverbs" or "sayings" might here be taken for granted in the context, especially as it could be understood from xxii. 17, where the Egyptian parallel is almost complete, more so than at xxii. 21. Then xxii. 21 corresponds in the Egyptian manual to "keep thyself from robbing a poor man, and from being tyrannical to a weak man." While there are other parallels, e.g., to xv. 16 and 17, the close verbal parallels in Proverbs are confined to xxii. 17–xxiii. 11, where we find not simply occasional parallels, that might be coincidences, but a fairly consecutive series.

The decision about the relationship between this Egyptian manual and proverbs depends upon an answer to the wider question—how did Hebrew collections of proverbs arise? The first collection goes back to the age of Solomon; as Gressmann observes, there is not the least reason to be sceptical about the statement (1 Kings iv. 32) that Solomon composed hundreds of such sayings. Now the age of Solomon was one of intercourse with other nations; indeed the names of the wise men with whom he is (1 Kings iv. 31) compared are foreign, perhaps Edomite, and proverbs of Edomite origin are included in the book of Proverbs (xxx. 1 f., cf. xxxi. 1). Also, Proverbs has two collections of "Solomonic" sayings (i.–ix., x.–xxii. 16), separated by a small section (xxii. 17–xxiv.) from a third "Solomonic" collection (xxv.–xxix.) compiled under King Hezekiah. Now the Egyptian parallels are specially to the interpolated section, which may be interpreted to contain "thirty" sayings; in this event the reading of the Egyptian manual (above noted) becomes important. Gressmann is prepared to date Proverbs x.–xxx., and perhaps even xxxi. 1–9, about 700 B.C.; i.–ix. and xxxi. 10 f. come later, from the Persian period, the noticeable feature about i.–ix. being that it has no saying about kings (they are merely referred to generally in viii. 15), and therefore bears no trace of the pre-exilic monarchy. Most critics date the bulk of Proverbs too late, Gressmann argues. He points out, for example, that the Egyptian source implies a view of retribution and recompense in the present life such as is presented in Proverbs, although the Hebrew writers purged it of its polytheistic and eschatological traits. Therefore, instead of regarding

this feature in Proverbs as due to the influence of the prophets, we ought to say that the prophets started from it. The conclusion is that the Egyptian manual seems to have been employed in one particular source of Proverbs. Hebrew "wise men" did not hesitate, in the days before the exile, to appreciate Egyptian ethical wisdom, and to make some use of it for their own purposes of religious instruction, just as afterwards they sought their ideas of culture in Persia and Hellas.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

(*a*) "It would, I think, be an interest and a profit to many of us who are studying your translation if you would say something in public about the charges brought against you by Dr. W. L. Courtney in the cutting from the *Daily Telegraph* which I venture to enclose. In particular, would you reply to what he says about Isaiah xxxvii. 22 and 2 Samuel xiii. 12? This would be a real favour to more than myself, I feel certain" (C. C. A., Liverpool).

Many thanks for your newspaper cutting, which I have read. We all respect Dr. Courtney's judgment in his own department, and it is in his favour that he has evidently read the book which he criticises. But I fear he has not read the preface, and so has failed to understand what the translation is and what it seeks to do. It is not meant for those who, like Dr. Courtney, prefer style to accuracy in a translation. He admits, for example, that the Authorised Version is not accurate in the line, "His neck is clothed with thunder," but then he adds, "who would wish to change it?" Well, many would, and many would be right in their desire. The conventional version is meaningless, though sonorous. Ask any reader what it means. He cannot tell you. Now the author of the book of Job meant something, in this detail of his description of the war-horse, and his readers knew what he meant; he intended to describe the horse's neck as clothed with a tossing or quivering mane, as even the Revised Version pointed out. He never dreamed of "thunder." That is a gratuitous error of the Authorised Version; a horse's neck does not make any sound. Dr. Courtney exclaims, "Some of these Biblical phrases are so magical in their grace and strength and beauty that we feel that any

tampering with them is an act almost of sacrilege." A noble sentiment, but wholly irrelevant to the present issue. If Dr. Courtney finds magical grace and beauty in this mistranslation, by all means let him keep it. But, as I said in my preface, the effect of a new version depends partly on the amount of culture possessed by readers who are willing to detach their minds for the time being from time-honoured associations," and those who are not equal to this might let the new translation alone. I do not think they should quarrel with those who wish to see a Hebrew author relieved from the verdict of having written magical nonsense.

As for the two specific cases to which you refer, the former is the first stanza in the taunt-song of Jerusalem over the king of Assyria. Dr. Courtney quotes from the Authorised Version the "fine opening lines: "The virgin, the daughter of Zion hath despised thee and laughed thee to scorn. The daughter of Jerusalem hath shaken her head at thee. What is Dr. Moffatt's version?

> She scorns you, she laughs at you,
> Sion the maiden;
> She tosses her head at you,
> Jerusalem the maid!

The occasion is made trivial, and the words, devoid of music, are set to an unimpressive refrain." Well, I am content to leave the two versions side by side, and ask any unprejudiced reader to judge how the second makes the occasion trivial, and where the words are devoid of music. As a matter of fact, this is poetry in the original, and the refrain is precisely what the Hebrew writer wrote. Dr. Courtney is evidently ignorant of the principles of Hebrew metre, with the short line coming second; the rhythmic beat of the refrain is organic to this form of Hebrew verse. And—to mention one detail—"shaking the head at thee" is hopelessly inadequate; it is a phrase which always recalls to me a governess shaking her head in weak reproach at naughty children. The Hebrew phrase is virile and energetic; it means "tossing the head" in proud derision. The idea is a mocking gesture, not a mild remonstrance or a mournful sigh. The Authorised Version therefore makes an anti-climax, which it should be our effort to remove, in order

to prevent anything trivial from spoiling the vehement passion of the stanza.

The second instance is in prose, in what Dr. Courtney calls "the ugly story of Tamar and Amnon. 'This sort of thing is not done in Israel,' says Tamar, curiously reminding us of Tesman in Ibsen's play. The colloquialism is shocking enough, but when we realise that the 'sort of thing' referred to is nothing less than incest, it becomes monstrous." This is misdirected emphasis; had Dr. Courtney understood the real meaning of the phrase, he would have restrained his indignation. He should get up his brief better before he goes into court. 'Incest' is a wrong term entirely. Tamar was a half-sister of Amnon, and marriages between such persons were permissible; indeed the girl pleads with Amnon to marry her. There would have been no objection to their marriage. The crime therefore is not what Dr. Courtney imagines it to be. No doubt it was bad enough; but this is indicated in the words quoted. Morality, as Dr. Courtney is well aware, was primarily a matter of *mores* in those days; custom prescribed the moral standard. When a Hebrew wished to brand a crime, he said, "It is not so done in Israel," almost as we to-day say, "This sort of thing is not done"; the practice does not obtain in Israel, whatever be the case elsewhere. It was not that he made light of it, and moderns have no right to brand him with the epithet of colloquial. He was quite serious, but he spoke in terms of his moral and social environment. The version I have given is the exact transcript of the original. Indeed my version, I claim, is more serious than the Authorised Version here. For the latter proceeds to make Tamar say, "do not thou this folly." Why does not Dr. Courtney hold up this to derision, as a shocking understatement? Literally taken, it is a deplorable anti-climax; he might well denounce it as monstrous. But, as every intelligent student knows, the Hebrew term for "folly" implies villany or profligacy, and what Tamar really said was, as I have put it, "do not be so profligate!"

This will show you, I trust, how a criticism like Dr. Courtney's falls to pieces, as soon as you confront it with the facts of the case. I am obliged to you for bringing his column under my notice. It has certainly given me the opportunity of explaining to you and others some points that may be serviceable to you

in your study of the Old Testament, even although the points are comparatively minor.

(*b*) " . . . But one of the losses I deplore is the text in 1 Kings xviii. 21 : ' How long halt ye between two opinions ? ' Is it necessary to alter this, as you do, into ' How long will you hobble on this faith and that ? ' Please do not count me a timid reactionary, but I want to be sure of the reasons why the new version is better than the old " (M. M., Shrewsbury).

I appreciate your position. The traditional text does make a good peg for sermons on the duty of making up your mind ; I have heard excellent discourses, which drove home the danger of halting or of putting off time, instead of deciding at once. But the word " halt " means to " limp " anyhow, and, although the original text is rather perplexing, there is very little doubt, I think, that what Elijah meant to say was to warn the people against trying two religions together. They are not to combine the worship of their own God with the worship of Baal. That is the sharp point of the prophet's call. It is not that the people had been hesitating between the two, but that they had been trying to blend them. And Elijah urges that this is not the way to get forward ; the two religions are so different that they are like two unequal legs—you hobble along with them. To use two such incongruous faiths is to be crippled, Elijah declares, and it is high time that Israel realised this. They must be one thing or another : " if the Eternal is God, follow Him ; if Baal, then follow him." This still makes a good text, you will admit. It is not meant for people who are irreligious, but for religious people who are unaware that their religion must be all of one piece, and that the true worship of God is incompatible with certain lower forms of worship, no matter how popular the latter may be.

TWO NOTES ON SECOND CORINTHIANS.

(*a*) *ὃς ἐκ τηλικούτου θανάτου ἐρύσατο ἡμᾶς καὶ ῥύεται* (v. l. *ῥύσεται*) *εἰς ὃν ἠλπίκαμεν ὅτι καὶ ἔτι ῥύσεται* (i. 10).

We may compare and contrast the bitter outburst of Agamemnon in the Iliad (ii. 116–118) :

οὕτω που Διὶ μέλλει ὑπερμενεῖ φίλον εἶναι.
ὃς δὴ πολλάων πολίων κατέλυσε κάρηνα
ἠδ' ἔτι καὶ λύσει.

He moodily reflects that Zeus, in his might, seems to like to lower man; he has brought low the crest of many a city and he will do it again. The apostle is still in danger, but he reflects that his God will again deliver him as He has done in the past.

(*b*) λοιπόν, ἀδελφοί, χαίρετε (good-bye), καταρτίζεσθε (mend your ways), παρακαλεῖσθε (listen to what I have told you, τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖτε, εἰρηνεύετε (xiii. 11). The meaning of τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖτε may be inferred from a passage like that in Menander's *Epitrepontes* (862, 863): Κἀγω σε ταῦτ' ἔμοὶ φρονεῖν ἀναγκάσω καὶ μὴ στασιάζειν. It is the opposite of quarrelling. "Live in harmony, do not quarrel."

SERMONS I HAVE NEVER HEARD.

The other Sunday, when a child had been baptized, the choir in our church sang the words of the blessing from the book of Numbers (vi. 24–6):

"The Lord bless thee and keep thee:
the Lord make his face shine upon thee and be gracious unto thee:
the Lord lift up his countenance upon thee and give thee peace."

It occurred to me that this threefold blessing might be taken to refer to the three main stages of our earthly life, to youth, middle age, and old age. I mentioned this to our minister during the course of the week, but he would not have anything to do with my suggestion. He said that the three clauses of the blessing are variations of the same thought. Now, I have not any knowledge of the original, and I defer to my spiritual instructor. Nevertheless I wonder whether it would not be legitimate to employ the text for the purpose which I have indicated. Youth needs to be "kept"; it is the dangerous period when we think we can guard ourselves, or perhaps that the world is not so dangerous as the Bible says it is. In middle life things are apt to darken down, and we need the shining of God's face to keep up our spirits; also if other people are ungrateful and unkind, leaving us to fight our own battles, we need to be specially assured of God's gracious favour. Lastly, old age needs to be soothed; its special boon is peace from the Lord. All this may sound fantastic, I dare say, to those who are

acquainted with the original meaning of the Blessing, but I do feel that a sermon which would bring out the thoughts I have indicated would be a help to some people in most of our congregations.

I have a young friend who calls himself a Socialist. We have talks upon religion, for although he will not enter a church he has a true interest in spiritual things, and he does not talk to me merely in order to shock my old-fashioned Christianity. He said to me once that he could not stand the self-engrossed piety of church-members, that they never thought of the next generation but only about themselves. I remember how keenly he quoted some lines from a modern poem, I think by the late Mr. George Meredith; they were, if I recollect aright,

> "Keep the young generations in hall,
> And bequeath them no tumbled house."

Now, he asked me triumphantly, do you ever hear sermons telling your people to try to leave the world a cleaner place for the next generation, telling them that instead of securing their own comfort in this world or in the next they ought to be spending their time and strength and means on what was due to those who were coming on. I am afraid I must have hesitated, for he added instantly, "No, and the reason is, there's not a word in your Bible about it!" Well, I have just come upon a text which seems to express this duty. There must be others, but I venture to put this one before your readers. It is from the seventy-first psalm, verses 17 and 18. "Hitherto have I declared thy wondrous works. Now also when I am old and grey-headed, O God, forsake me not; until I have showed thy strength unto this generation, and thy power to everyone that is to come." It seems to me that this is a noble and unselfish prayer, which displays a true concern for the next generation, and while it makes a good text from which to preach a sermon, I think the preacher would be justified in saying that the duty is not discharged entirely by preaching sermons. Surely we can show the next generation how great and good God is, by putting His purpose into effect, in so far as we can; I mean, not simply by telling them about God, although the witness of a long life to the Divine mercy is impressive, but also by showing God's strength in securing strong, good habits for the younger people,

and by providing them with every outward chance of realising God's presence and power in their own lives.

Lastly, let me suggest with much diffidence a sermon upon Isaiah lxiii. 8 : " For he said, Surely they are my people, children that will not lie (R.V. deal falsely) : so he was their Saviour." First, the generosity of God's estimate ; He is prepared to trust us. Secondly, His action ; " so he was their Saviour." He not only thinks well of us but acts upon His thought of us.

A. R. M.

REVIEWS.

THE CHILDREN'S BIBLE.[1]

Mr. Mee knows better than probably anyone else in our country how to reach the interest and intelligence of children. It is not the least of his services that he has now prepared an edition of the Bible in a form that appeals to children, printed as a story-book, without any numbering of chapters and verses, and handsomely illustrated. Within less than 500 pages he has contrived to present the story of the Bible, so that the reader is carried on from beginning to end. Genealogies and some less edifying matters are omitted, but nothing vital. And the text is printed from the Authorised Version with all its high associations. " If men must have wonders in these days, here is a wonder for them. This book was written by unknown men before men had paper to write on. It was made into an Authorised English Version by forty-seven men of whom not one wrote anything on his own account, though they made this book the greatest English book of any age." Mr. Mee and his publishers have worked together to give children an edition of this wonder which will bring out some of its wonder. The appeal is rightly to the eye, by pictures and type. And the result is an edition free from the heaviness and dulness with which conventional editions of our Bible are associated. Teachers and parents, no less than children, will be grateful for this most successful effort.

[1] *The Children's Bible :* being the Bible Story told in the Bible's own words. Arranged by Arthur Mee. Illustrated from the Art Galleries of the World. London : Hodder and Stoughton. Price 7*s.* 6*d.*

The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament, illustrated from the papyri and other non-literary sources. Part V. By George Milligan, D.D. London: Hodder and Stroughton. Price 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

This part of Dr. Milligan's invaluable lexicon reaches from *μαγεύω* to *ὀψώνιον*. It is executed with the care and skill to which we have become accustomed in the earlier parts; one can only guess at the enormous labour involved in disentangling the relevant material, and it is excellent news that the sixth part will follow before very long. The enterprise is one for which all students of the New Testament text are increasingly grateful.

All that can be done, by way of reviewing a work so well planned and so accurately edited, is to offer a few comments upon some of the words treated.

It is curious that, apart from the LXX of Isaiah xxxv. 6, the earliest occurrence of *μογιλάλος* (Mark vii. 32) should be in a second-century papyrus. Dr. Milligan notes the variant *μογγιλάλος* in the MSS. of Mark; it occurs also in the MSS. of the LXX.

For the strong particle *ναί*, we are referred to Matthew xv. 27 *al.*; but Professor Turner (*The Study of the New Testament*, 2nd ed., p. 70) has recently suggested that in Mark vii. 28 its omission by the Western authorities is correct. In which case it would be a word characteristic of Matthew's gospel.

Dr. Milligan thinks that the vernacular use of *ξενία* = hospitality tells against the rendering of it as "quarters" or "lodgings" in Acts xxviii. 23 and Philemon 22. But Dr. Hitchcock's recent article in the EXPOSITOR (October, p. 279) confirms the view that *ξενία* in these passages denotes what a Latin would have called *hospitium*.

The double negative *οὐ μή* seems to be comparatively rare in the papyri; Dr. Milligan notes that the majority of its uses in the New Testament "are found in passages derived from the Old Testament and in the sayings of our Lord, which, therefore, have Semitic originals." Apparently it is the usage in the Old Testament and in Philo which also explains the metaphorical sense of a term like *ὀχύρωμα* in 2 Corinthians x. 4, for the papyri yield no parallels.

* * * * *

Der Zweite Korintherbrief. Von D. Dr. Hans Windisch. Göttingen : Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1924. Pp. viii., 436. Price, 15*s.* 6*d.*; bound, 18*s.*

The first epistle to the Corinthians, in this, the ninth, edition of the Meyer *Commentary*, was edited by Professor Johannes Weiss. He died before he could complete his work on the second epistle, and the task has been assigned to the competent hands of Dr. Windisch of Leyden. Weiss's edition of *First Corinthians* is one of the very best New Testament commentaries ; it is, like Lagrange's edition of *Mark's Gospel*, an indispensable book upon its subject, a model of relevant and illuminating exegesis. Dr. Windisch has had a hard task in following so notable a contributor to the series, but it is fair to say that his work is not unworthy of its predecessor upon the first epistle. We have here a full and fair commentary, well equipped upon the side of linguistic scholarship, and sensitive to the movements of the apostle's mind. The well-known difficulties of Second Corinthians are faced adequately, and the book provides an interpretation of its meaning in the light of contemporary religious life as well as of the historical context in the career of the apostle.

Dr. Windisch naturally has to spend much of his strength on the literary problem. He is not prepared to break up the unity of chapters i.–vii. ; though he feels that even this section contains a variety of strata, the main result he is sure about is that vi. 14–vii. 1 is a misplaced fragment. On the other hand, he is disposed to regard chapter ix. as originally a separate note, referring to the same subject as chapter viii., but designed for a wider audience than Corinth. This does not work out so well ; it involves some very hypothetical constructions, including the view that when chapter ix. was inserted, the words, *σὺν τοῖς ἁγιοις πᾶσιν τοῖς οὖσιν ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ Ἀχαΐᾳ.* were added in i. 1. As for x.–xiii., Dr. Windisch decides to follow the suggestion of Krenkel, that this was written a month or two later, perhaps after a special visit to Corinth, when some fresh crisis had emerged. It is serviceable to have this point of view argued. Dr. Windisch is clear that x.–xiii. cannot have followed i.–ix. as they stand ; so far, he is convinced that the canonical arrangement of the epistle is impossible. But the arguments he brings forward against the view that x.–xiii. is to be connected with the sharp,

earlier epistle, which preceded i.–ix., are not cogent. The merit of his edition is that it will compel reconsideration of the problem ; but it is very doubtful if his own solution is preferable to that worked out so ably, for example, by Schmiedel in his commentary. More is required if we are to imagine that, after the arguments in i.–ix., a recrudescence of the trouble at Corinth arose, such as Dr. Windisch imagines. The identification of x.–xiii. with the earlier, sharp epistle, has its own difficulties, exegetical and historical, but these are not greater than the difficulties involved in the present hypothesis.

Second Corinthians, as Dr. Hort remarked, " glows with an intenser heat of fervid life than any other in the New Testament, unless it be the first epistle of St. John." This glow is partly due to the personal issues raised, partly due to the sharp transitions of mood, and Dr. Windisch's edition penetrates to these through a study of the language. This is shown, for example, in his discussion of i. 8–10 and of xi. 32 f. The former passage is deeply interesting, from the psychological point of view ; it implies that a reconciliation between two parties is often facilitated if one of them is in trouble. But Dr. Windisch here, as in v. 16, regards the plural as including others, which is doubtful, doubtful even in v. 1 f., where he agrees with those who, like Bousset, decline to take the words as an expression of Paul's personal hope.

* * * * *

The Making of Modern India. Nicol Macnicol, M.A., D.Litt., Author of " Indian Theism," " Psalms of Maratha Saints," etc. Oxford University Press. Price 7*s.* 6*d.*

Rabindranath Tagore in his " Creative Unity " complains that the West has not sent out its humanity to India, but only its machine. Dr. Macnicol, at any rate, has brought his humanity to India. He has striven to enter sympathetically into the inner mind of the Hindus, and especially into what is best in their forms of thought and religious belief. Wide sympathy along with competent scholarship and spiritual insight has enabled him to give us this singularly illuminating and stimulating volume.

Almost all its seventeen chapters have been already published in the *Contemporary Review*, the *Atlantic Monthly*, the *Hibbert Journal*, the EXPOSITOR, the *International Review of Missions*,

the *East and the West*. The last chapter on *The Diversions of an Indian Village* appeared in the empire number of the *Times* newspaper.

As the title of the volume, *The Making of Modern India*, suggests, Dr. Macnicol deals with a wide variety of forces—political, social and religious—which are at work in the making of the new India. He gives us a vivid picture of the extraordinary variety of the religious beliefs and practices of the peoples of India, from the high-toned religion of the adherents of the Brāhmo Samāj and similar theistic movements down to the degrading cults of a larger or less number of "devout" Hindus. (The Mohammedanism of India is scarcely referred to.) He gives us also a discriminating estimate of creative personalities of a past generation, such as Rājā Rām Mohun Roy, Keshub Chunder Sen, and Devendranath Tagore, the father of Rabindranath Tagore, and of creative personalities of the present generation, such as Ghandi, Sadhu Sunder Singh, and B. G. Tilak (to be distinguished from N. V. Tilak, an accomplished and fervent Christian). Further, he reminds us again and again that the deepest root of social unrest amongst the poor and illiterate village folk is hunger or the fear of hunger.

With his intimate acquaintance with the conditions of life in modern India, Dr. Macnicol will be found a helpful guide to those who are interesting themselves in the political and social problems with which the British Government is confronted in India to-day, and likely to be confronted for many a long day to come. But perhaps the chief interest of his book is the help it affords for a better understanding of the relation of India to Christianity.

He lays stress upon the fact that through contact with Western civilisation for more than a hundred years India has had a fresh awakening of intellectual and religious life. One effect of this awakening has been to send many earnest-minded Hindus back to what is best in the spiritual heritage they have in their own sacred scriptures. The result has been seen in various movements for reform in religious belief and in ethical and social ideals, which have had important success amongst the educated classes. These reformers would refuse to be reckoned Christians, but many of them willingly acknowledge how much they owe to the life and teaching of Jesus. Dr.

Macnicol tells us that in 1820, one of the earliest and most influential of these reformers, Rājā Rām Mohun Roy, published a book, entitled *The Precepts of Jesus, the Guide to Peace and Happiness*, and gave this as his reason for publishing it: "This simple code of religion and morality is so admirably calculated to elevate men's ideas to high and liberal notions of God, and is also so well fitted to regulate the conduct of the human race in their various duties to God, to themselves and to society, that I cannot but hope the best effects from its promulgation in its present form." Dr. Macnicol quotes in another chapter what a recent non-Christian Bengali writer has said of Christianity. "It has given us Christ and taught us noble, moral, and spiritual lessons which we have discovered anew in our own scriptures, and thereby satisfied our self-love and made them our very own. It has awakened a new spirit of inquiry in the drooping Hindu mind. It has made Hinduism conscious of its greatness. It has held up to view the baneful effect of certain soul-degrading customs which used to prevail, and prevail still, in Hindu society. In short, it has quickened it with a new life, the full fruition of which is not yet."

Dr. Macnicol is at pains to remind us that apart altogether from modern movements for religious reformation the Hindus as a people "have more earnestly occupied themselves with the search for God and more earnestly longed for God than perhaps any other people." But what he finds lacking is a worthy conception of the God with whom they strive to get into communion. Too often, even for the best of them, God is the Nameless One, an Absolute without ethical character, and without an ethical purpose at work in the life of humanity—with the result that their religious earnestness issues in a quietism which does little to foster active service to their fellows and to their country. Dr. Macnicol indicates what a change will come over the social life of India when devout and unworldly Hindus find their God in God as He has been revealed in Christ—in Christ's love and loving service.

It is in this direction he looks forward with expectancy to what Christianity may yet do for the peoples of India. He has a warm appreciation of the greatness of their own spiritual heritage, and is concerned that this heritage should somehow be conserved in the growing Christian Church of India. He

believes that along this line Christianity will make a wider and more effective appeal to the Hindu heart and conscience. He believes also that the rising Church of the East may have a significant service to render to the Church of the West by helping it to a fuller understanding of the mind of the one Master. "There was a Greek Christianity and a Latin Christianity, each with its own vision of certain aspects of the whole truth. The Indian soul may surely in like manner make its own contribution, which we may well believe likely to be peculiarly precious and profound, to that discovery." But "the Indian Christian mind has not as yet fashioned the formulæ of its own theology or the framework of its own Church."

D. M. Ross.

* * * * *

Christianity and the State. By S. Parkes Cadman. New York: Macmillan.

The war opened our eyes to the moral bankruptcy of the modern state; it showed us the dangers of nationalism and revealed the low standard of our international ethics. Dr. Cadman quotes the confession of a famous diplomat:—"The service of the state has spoiled me as a human being." The modern state is not only secular, it is in some respects anti-Christian; its outlook is materialistic, its aims selfish. International and class warfare present a direct challenge to the Church to seek and to save the world from destruction.

It was natural, therefore, that when Dr. Cadman was asked to deliver a course of lectures to his brethren in the ministry under the Earl foundation, he chose as his subject "Christianity and the State." Much has been written on the subject of Church and State, and those interested in the historical aspects of this subject will find much information in these pages. But Dr. Cadman's subject is wider and more important. For the Church may reach the most comfortable *modus vivendi* with the State; she may have gained all the liberty she desires for herself, and yet have failed in that for which she exists, the redemption of the world. The Church can never have rest till the kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of His Christ.

It requires a competent historian to deal with so great a subject. He must be able to tell us how the modern secular

state has come into being. How far is the modern separation between politics and religion due to the corrosive tendencies which have been at work in Protestantism since the Reformation, and how far to the secular spirit of the Renaissance? The modern cry "Back to the Middle Ages" is an attractive one. Dr. Cadman does full justice to the achievements of the Mediæval Church, and to its still higher ideals. "From the Nebo of his bold speculations, Hildebrand surveyed a future which appeared to him overflowing with milk and honey. Behind him were the dreary sands and the sterile wastes of misspent ages; the hopeless, bloodstained struggles of monarchs and mobs; and the slow sure stagnation of social death. Who does not share his throb of spiritual delight as, from his lonely elevation, he descried a new world in which righteousness would dwell?" But the historian will also mark the failure of the great pontiff's dreams; he will realise that it is impossible to transfer the ideals and methods of the Middle Ages *en bloc* into our modern world. "The exceptional privileges of the Church as a temporal power are no longer tolerated by free peoples. Whatever earthly authority belongs to her has to be won in the loftier regions of moral suasion and assent."

Dr. Cadman is a very competent historian. He has already given proof of his quality in *The Three Religious Leaders of Oxford, Wycliffe, Wesley and Newman*. The extent of his reading is revealed by the bibliography, and still more by the packed pages of the book before us. He is also singularly impartial. His appraisal of the gains and losses of the Reformation is admirable in its detachment. He has a sympathetic understanding of the Roman Catholic standpoint, and frequently refers to Lord Acton's *History of Freedom*. Only in his treatment of the German nation do we seem to detect a not unnatural post-war bias. Rudolph Eucken "became the dupe and tool of imperialistic frenzy." The Great War "ended in the defeat of the arch-criminals against civilisation," and so on. Perhaps this bias makes Dr. Cadman less than just towards Luther and the German Reformation. "Luther made the Church the helot of the State." "The exaggeration of the State which has always been the weakness of Germany manifested itself as far back as the Reformation." Now Luther's theory of the relationship between Church and State was, as Dr. Cadman himself admits, by no means

Erastian. It was Luther who drew the famous distinction between the power of the sword and the keys, and although his theory has never been found entirely workable in practice—for either the State covets the keys or the Church the sword—it has the highest Scriptural authority.

How is the modern state to be cured of her distempers of nationalism and militarism, of secularism and materialism? Dr. Cadman suggests that if the Church is to be the physician it must first heal itself. Protestantism is ineffective because of its divisions. Education in America is largely secular, not because the majority of the citizens do not desire to have religion taught in the schools, but because they cannot agree on the particular brand desired. A house divided against itself cannot stand. The secularist has not been slow to make profit out of sectarianism.

Again, divided Protestantism is largely responsible for the evils of nationalism. The League of Churches for the Promotion of World Friendship is likely to be ineffective until the Churches themselves come closer together. The hope of the future lies in a Protestantism which is also Catholic.

But Dr. Cadman goes farther than this. He has little hope of union between Roman Catholics and Protestants. Their standpoints are too different. But if Christianity is to be conserved and God's Kingdom to be extended, they must learn to co-operate. The withdrawal from the Copec Conference of the Roman Catholic representatives was a great loss, nevertheless the preliminary investigations, in which Roman Catholics took part, revealed the real agreement which exists in the minds of Christians in regard to many, if not all, of our social and international problems. It is in the development of a united Christian consciousness, a consciousness which is not afraid to express itself in action, that the hope of the future lies. "Before both Catholicism and Protestantism lies the non-Christian world, with its countless antagonisms and agonies, always there, eagerly waiting for the Gospel of Redemption and Brotherhood, which those Churches have received from the Saviour of mankind and which they are under a solemn obligation to proclaim. In that world, and not in theological or ecclesiastical warfare, is the theatre, as it seems to me, of any approximate agreements between them."

D. W. Greenfield.

CURRENT LITERATURE.

Two popular biographies of Scotsmen in the mission field are now published, *Gilmour of Mongolia* (by W. P. Nairne) and *Tom Dobson* (by Dr. Nicol MacNicol), each costing 3*s.* 6*d.* (Hodder and Stoughton). Gilmour's life has been already told by Mr. Richard Lovett, but it bears re-telling for our generation; it is the record of hard, pioneering work, done by a man of intense devotion. Young Dobson's life is told for the first time by a friend and colleague. He was a strong personality, deeply interested in the outcast of India, whose life he served at Poona and Jalna, as a printer in the local missions. He was murdered in 1922 by an Arab servant. Dr. MacNicol tells the story of his life in a way which throws much light upon the labour problem of modern India, and the short biography is one to stir the reader's interest in the man and in his special work, the work of a layman who sought to release the poor natives from the grip of an evil money-lending system and to bring them into social as well as religious freedom.

* * * * *

The Wesleyan Methodist Social Welfare Department did well to induce the Rev. F. J. Harvey to write a small book on *Sunday Observance* (The Epworth Press, City Road, London, E.C.). For ninepence this excellent short study may be purchased. Its merit is that it presents a sane case for resisting the secularisation of Sunday, without appealing to a "Sabbatarianism" which no longer commands credit. The problem of Sunday observance has become extremely urgent in most parts of the country, and it is essential that those who seek to conserve the good of Sunday should argue their case wisely. To identify it with any statutory enforcement of the Old Testament Sabbath is out of the question. Mr. Harvey, like those for whom he speaks, lays proper stress upon the value attached by our Lord to the day as a day of worship and human service, and corrects the common idea that our Lord approved of laxity in this respect. To all clergymen and ministers, especially, we very cordially recommend this pamphlet; they will learn from its pages how to handle the subject intelligently and effectively.

CURRENT ISSUES.

THERE is an incident in the life of Jesus, where He had to rebuke His disciples for misjudging an outsider. They had seen this man expelling devils by using the name of the Lord; he was an exorcist, a successful one, but they had checked him because he did not belong to the special company of the disciples. Jesus, instead of approving their excommunication, told them, "Forbid him not; for there is no man which shall do a mighty work in My name, and be able quickly to speak evil of Me. For he that is not against us is for us." Professor Hogg of Madras, in the January number of *The International Review of Missions*, says that this incident always reminds him of Dr. Albert Schweitzer. Why?

* * * * *

Well, when Schweitzer published his first famous book on *The Quest of the Historical Jesus*, he did not seem to Professor Hogg to be "following" along with the disciples of Christ. In fact, he almost seemed to be "speaking evil" of the Master. He emphasized the eschatological element in our Lord's teaching so loudly that Jesus seemed to be left as a visionary enthusiast, out of touch with our modern life. Jesus mistook the cause of history; He imagined the end of the world was imminent, and His teaching is bound up with this creed. Now, as Professor Hogg puts it, "there must be many Christians to whom this will seem a degree of unorthodoxy almost amounting to blasphemy." Indeed Schweitzer's interpretation was hotly repudiated by many writers in the Church. They said as well as thought that he had no right to be speaking in the name of Jesus Christ.

* * * * *

Yet Dr. Schweitzer has become a medical missionary in Equatorial Africa. He has shown heroic self-sacrifice, and his book

On the Edge of the Primeval Forest reveals him now as a man "animated by a passion of brotherliness and a deep and humble devotion to the Lord Jesus." Who can hesitate, Professor Hogg asks, to recognize him as a member of the real band of Christ's disciples? So the Professor now recognizes the essential reverence in Schweitzer's work, for all its radical and even disparaging estimate of the historical Jesus.

* * * * *

But Schweitzer has also written a treatise on *The Philosophy of Civilisation*, and Professor Hogg is not prepared to agree with his conclusions. He will not abandon idealism and he will not base his hopes and efforts for the future upon such intuitions as Dr. Schweitzer employs. For this he gives reasons and reasons, of a philosophical character. Yet candidly he owns one debt to the book he criticizes. Many of us missionaries, he admits, "are so preoccupied by the toil of running complex missionary organizations which quite obviously have some effect in the way of social and spiritual uplift, that we incur real danger of imagining that the kingdom of God itself can be achieved by mere selfless labour." Dr. Schweitzer holds that this kind of expectation was not entertained by Jesus; human labour of this kind is only a sort of prayer to God that He will make the kingdom appear soon and suddenly. Jesus did not regard the kingdom as some end "to be achieved by skill of human endeavour or to be attained by way of social evolution." It is well, says Professor Hogg, that we should be reminded of the proportion and limitation of anything we can do, in the service of the Kingdom.

* * * * *

Do people to-day think more about pain than about sin? And is this one of the differences between the mediæval and the modern spirit? Dr. Thouless suggests that it is, in his book on *The Lady Julian*. It is one of a series published by the S.P.C.K., called "English Theologians." Dr. Thouless claims that this fourteenth-century mystic and recluse at Norwich deserves to be ranked with Bishop Butler and Hooker, because by her writing she has contributed to the maturing of English religious life. It is a high claim, and even after reading the sympathetic exposition of Dr. Thouless one may remain convinced that Lady Julian belongs to English saints rather than

to theologians. However, it is with this issue raised in the chapter on her views of sin that we are concerned at present.

* * * * *

The Middle Ages were not sensitive, whatever they may have been. Things were tolerated in manners as well as in morals that shock our modern susceptibilities. There was a strong callousness in most circles of society, which accepted pain as part of the order of things, if not for oneself at least for other people. "Mediæval institutions had not human happiness as their object," Dr. Thouless observes, "and they inflicted unnecessary suffering with a callousness which shows a totally different attitude towards the world from that of modern humanitarianism" But mediæval religion did concern itself with sin. Their theology, of penance in particular and of the sacraments in general, was a sustained effort to manage human nature in an environment of sin which might easily become fatal.

* * * * *

Nowadays the emphasis has changed. The problem of pain engrosses people; it moulds religions, it stirs psychological interest, it leads to humanitarian activity and social reform. It is so real to us that, as Dr. Thouless humorously puts it, "churches can be filled when a preacher promises to say some new thing about it." If he is wise, he will not make any such promise. He need not. All he has to do is to promise to preach about it, and he secures attention if not an audience. For pain comes home to nearly every one, either as a fact of their own experience or as something observed in the life of others. Whereas sin does not. The average man of to-day, we are told, does not worry about sin. Swinburne once apostrophized Newman and Carlyle.

> "Go honoured hence, go home,
> Night's sightless children; here your hour is done,
> Pass with the stars and leave us with the sun."

He meant that this enlightened age required no more prophets of repentance, no more reminders of dark moral evil.

* * * * *

But Swinburne's neo-paganism was too hasty and shallow. Sensitiveness to pain is all to the good, provided that it does not become sentimental. Nevertheless, the sense of sin is a

permanent feature of religion, and, though we need not go back to all the mediæval theories about it, we moderns do not escape it by ignoring it. This may be a truism, but it is none the less true. To cast off warnings about sin is not to be "left with the sun" but to remain in darkness. This is sound New Testament teaching, which goes infinitely deeper than Swinburne's rhodomontade.

* * * * *

An unexpected and powerful witness to this truth has just started up. In Professor Rait's *Memorials of A. V. Dicey*, a letter from Professor Dicey is quoted which seriously supports the doctrine of original sin. It was written in 1915 to Lord Bryce about the German atrocities in Belgium. These, Dicey said "with full seriousness to one who will understand me," are only explicable on the old doctrine of original sin—which, he hastens to add, "is of course with any educated Englishman quite unconnected with the belief in Eve and her apple." There are inherent vices in human nature, connected somehow with our inheritance from the lower animal world, vices which now and then burst through conventional civilization.

* * * * *

This is not a popular doctrine. Professor Dicey tells us that when he once propounded it at the Athenæum, he was taunted with being a cynic. He was amazed to receive a letter from his friend President Eliot of Harvard, advising him to get rid of belief in original sin and to put faith in progress. The English scholar knew more about human nature as a jurist and a publicist than his optimistic friend in Boston, however, and argued correctly that belief in original sin is quite compatible with a belief in progress. "I am astounded," he writes, "at this easy optimism which overlooks the dark sides of human nature." Professor Dicey might not have agreed with Newman and Carlyle; indeed he cared little for Carlyle. But he would not have accepted for a moment the cheerful air of his old fellow-Oxonian, Swinburne.

A THEOLOGY OF CRISIS.

II.

Barth gives three possible methods of treating the theological problem.[1] The first is the *dogmatic* method by which the old christological, soteriological and eschatological doctrines are promulgated on the authority of the teachings of the Bible and the Church. It is the method of a supranaturalistic orthodoxy. The weakness of this method consists in the attempt to express the content of the revelation in a too concrete, too direct way as if these truths were objects to be grasped and conceived by our understanding. Such a direct answer which conveys God's truth in the way of scientific treatment, is too easy and suppresses the sacred and trembling quest of man for God, which alone can be the true expression of man's relation to his Creator and Judge.

The second method is the *critical* one. We should rather say, the way of mysticism. Barth calls it the "critical" way in so far as the mystic, in order to attain God's presence, begins with a criticism of man's empiric being and advises him to die. Luther himself went this way for awhile, with the great mystics. The advantage of this method compared with the first one consists in the fact that the empiric being of man is seriously doubted when the question of God is raised. It is a dynamic method compelling action, whilst the first method with its sole demand for firm belief leaves man quiet, unchanged. But it is impossible to speak of God in this way because the final conclusion is a simple negation, the negation of man and the negation of any attribute by which he may try to assimilate God's being.

The third method is the *dialectic* one. It is solely appro-

[1] *Wort Gottes*, S. 167.

priate to the treatment of the great truth of faith. The yea of the dogmatic method and the nay of the critical method are both presupposed. But this affirmation and this negation are not set forth independently; they are only two aspects of that mysterious truth which lies between the extremes. Only in a constant relationship to this living Truth, inaccessible to each one independently, they can get their relative meaning. Therefore a too direct statement concerning the transcendent world has at once to be corrected or annulled by its opposite, containing as much truth as the positive utterance. No rigid or static yea or nay is adequate to the dynamic mystery of the living God. For instance, if we speak of God's glory in the creation we have to keep in mind at the same time the *Deus absconditus* who in no way is manifest in nature as our eyes see it. If we speak of man's resemblance to God we have to remember that the man we know is a *fallen* creature. If we speak of Death we cannot do it without thinking of the majesty of future Life. We cannot speak of sin without knowing that it is forgiven. Thus neither the affirmation alone nor the negation alone expresses the truth. It lies between, and can only be expressed as the annulment of the positiveness by the negation and by dialectical and paradoxical affirmation of the negation.

It seems here as if Barth would betray religious truths to philosophical methods. One thinks of Schelling's philosophy of identity, and especially of Hegel's dialectic method. Also Fichte saw in the dialectic method the only way for the finite Ego to think the absolute Ego. And Kant in trying to express transcendent values was led to the antinomies. Fichte reserved thinking without contradiction to God alone; Man's thinking is contradictory, and a yea is true only in relation to a no. Nobody developed this dialectic method more than Hegel, however. In his dialectic

rhythm of thesis-antithesis-synthesis the positive is an element of the negative and vice versa. Truth is never to be expressed in the positiveness of one single sentence, but only in the dynamic relationship of the parts to an organic whole or system: dialectics are therefore the rational-irrational method of thinking the superrational. Dialectic judgments by their very nature annul themselves. It is well known that the Sophists whom Hegel called real masters in reflective ratiocination were masters in this art of the dialectic eristic.

Barth seems not to be aware of the common parentage of his method with that of the German Idealism which he combats. But the parentage, which has led to the characterization of this theology as "dialectical theology," is more formal than real. This dialectic theology does not attempt to approach the transcendent world, does not claim to have the last word, nor to give an authentic understanding of God's revelation. Such dialectic judgments would be at once annulled by the dialectic method itself; the dialectic antinomy would remain an antinomy. Barth makes it clear, over and again, that no human method reaches God, no speculation and no dialectics. If he applies the dialectic method it is for protecting the Transcendent against any human and too direct attempt to express it in clear cut positive terms or finite formulae; *finitum non est capax infiniti.*

The source of any understanding of God's intention for man lies not in any human method, not even in the dialectic one, but in Jesus Christ exclusively. He is the Word of God to man. But the dialectic method checks the old orthodox conception of the life and work of Jesus as well as the modern historic or psychological interpretation of Christ. Orthodoxy, although granted deeper understanding of God's mysteries, speaks in too direct a way of the divine

Logos and tries to perceive God's Will without respect for that reserve which is due to His transcendent majesty. On the other hand, Liberalism has quite lost the real meaning of God's revelation by making Jesus exclusively a character in human history. With Jesus the new æon appears, "vertically" from Heaven, miraculously placed amidst us by God's will. Christ is not a part of history. In so far as he belongs also to historical events, he is irrelevant for us. In so far as he participates in the culture and problems of his time, as he can be described by the word *zeitgeschichtlich*, he is a part of that same "Fair" as the rest of the world. In this respect the tradition of the Bible concerning his words and deeds is susceptible to the critical methods of modern theology. But what these methods distil from the different traditions, what explanation is extracted from the meshes of psychological or historic analysis is nearly worthless and has nothing to do with the real meaning of Christ's manifestation. So far, theology and the Church have done more to leave the knowledge of God asleep than to waken it. The meaning of revelation can only lie beyond all historic and psychological inquiries,[1] though these of course have their relative rights in the sphere of human history. Barth defends thus the right of the criticism of the Bible as a historic and literary document. As such it has entirely the character of human contingency and relativity.[2] He does not take, for instance, the miracles of the Bible as historic events, but only as an illustration, or a general example, of the nature of the new æon appearing in history.

Christ is the end of history, God's final judgment on human sins and virtues, religious efforts, faith and ethics. Christ closes the tragic disruption between God and man which fills history, and restores the former organic unity

[1] *Wort Gottes*, p. 76. [2] *Wort Gottes*, p. 196.

between God and his creature. Therefore Christ cannot be understood or explained as an historic event. He is the irruption of God's Power into this world, i.e. of the new æon into the old one, He is the crisis between Time and Eternity.

History is entirely subject to the wrath of God in the same way as the empiric nature, or the human spirit. God ends it by His judgment. It is over. A new creation has begun, the reign of Grace has replaced the reign of sin. Christ has revealed it as the *Κύριος*, as the Son of God. What we call the historic Jesus, who can be contemplated in an objective way as a personality, has nothing to do with this revelation.[1] This would be the Jesus *κατὰ σάρκα* whom St. Paul knows no more. He would be quite as problematic as all other historic persons.

The real meaning of his revelation lies in the Cross. The meaning is the *consummatio mundi*, the abrogation of all Being, the end of history.[2] The Cross is not, as is often preached, the victory of Divine Love over human hatred, or the glorious ethical effort of a supreme sacrifice. It is rather the last obscurity in which human history ends, the last doubt to which the questioning of God's nature leads, the despair wherefrom the only possible question arises : My God, why hast Thou forsaken me ? It is the great and terrible No ! spoken in judgment over all human beings.

But this is only one side of the dialectic judgment. The No of the Cross is just one aspect of the Yea of God's Grace which renews everything. The Cross which is judgment is also the new Life which can be formed only through Death. God's Yea can only be heard or understood by the soul which accepts His No ! This is the

[1] K. Barth, *Die Auferstehung der Toten*, p. 24 (Kaiser, München, 1924).
[2] Barth, *Wort Gottes*, p. 88.

"impossible new possibility," the new beginning with the Cross.[1]

But the dialectic does not allow us to rest upon this paradoxical discovery. The revelation is quite as much a veiling of God as a manifestation. It would be wrong to take this new revealed Life as a divine gift which is now in our possession or as an object of our knowledge. It is ours only by Faith. "Faith has nothing to do with Religion [2] and Religion's false claim to know, to distribute the heavenly gifts as dishes during a banquet. Jesus has nothing to do with Religion." Faith is the leap into the abyss of the utmost loneliness, into the last devouring doubt. Faith is the divine instinct in the human soul for what is invisible, impalpable, and unreal (in the ordinary sense). Faith exists only in so far as it does not claim to communicate any historic or psychic realities,[3] only in so far as it gives God's reality which annuls all other reality. Barth compares faith with a shellhole. It is only the place where the irruption from God's world becomes manifest. It does not contain anything which can be taught or received by Religion. Faith is the absolute awe of what we are not, what we do not possess nor do ourselves. "It is the courage to know what God alone knows." Therefore Faith is never a security or an assured position, it is like standing in the air, a miracle, although it may also have its human, historic or psychological aspect. Barth renews thus the old *Credo quia absurdum.* Not only to the unbeliever, but also to the believer Christ's work remains hidden because it is never grasped as a psychic, historic or cosmic datum. It is God's fidelity towards us in its utmost concealment.[4] In Jesus "God reveals Himself as the unknown God and speaks as God who is eternally

[1] *Wort Gottes,* p. 89.
[2] *Wort Gottes,* p. 93.
[3] *Römerbrief,* ii. A, p. 16 ff.
[4] *Römerbrief,* ii. A, p. 74.

silent. The self-communication of God in Jesus begins with his repulsion of all impertinent religious arrogance and usurpation." It is the strongest repudiation of any mystical claim to a *unio mystica*.

And so also the new Life remains hidden (Col. iii. 3). "It is not Life, unless it is concealed." The Kingdom of God is never openly present; it has never come, it is only announced. It is only near. God's Kingdom never becomes a psychic power in the empiric man, never a physical power in this nature which we know, never a cosmic power in this æon. It remains God's Power which is sensible only as the great No spoken on this world and this man as they are. It is entirely eschatological, never to be realized in a definite historical moment of the future, only in God's Future.

The day of the Kingdom, of the resurrection, is the last day of man and therefore not to be found in the relativity of Time. The second coming of Christ is therefore no historic event,[1] it is a new world which is not the continuance or the development of the old one. It is *totaliter aliter*. Hence it is meaningless to discuss the possibility even of the resurrection. It is not a miracle in the sense of an exceptional case in this world. All the reports on the empty tomb cannot convince us of the historicity of a fact which remains entirely ambiguous. Yet it is the signal of the future new world, whose greatest miracle is the forgiveness of sin, the possibility of a new and good beginning in the midst of evil. The resurrection of Christ is the "unhistorical" relationship of his whole historic Life to its hidden origin in God and can only be assimilated by the category of Revelation.[2] And in so far as we are buried and died with Christ we participate also in his resurrection. But

[1] *Wort Gottes*, p. 95.
[2] *Römerbrief*, ii. A, p. 177; *Auferstehung*, p. 74 ff.

this new life is never visible, and its effect never can be shown as token of an ethical transformation. All that is visible is the empiric man, the old Adam,[1] who has to die.

Christ's resurrection is not only God's miracle done on Christ, but God's miracle done in us. Christians are waiting for it as for God's deed. They cannot deserve it by their faith or their ethical efforts. If so, then what is the ethical problem ? Here indeed is a crux of the dialectic theology. It is of course in strongest opposition to any system of an idealistic moralism. The question, what shall we do ? has no sense.[2] God has nothing to do with individual life. It is not the place where His will is or can be done. The meaning of ethics is to produce the necessary crisis which precedes the act of grace. By putting the moral obligation before man, ethics cannot do more than show that man is not capable of doing God's will. Where the moral problem is raised, the judgment has to be spoken. Christianism as an ethical system is impossible. Even the fulfilment of the categoric imperative is an impossible task. Ethics, in short, is human sickness which leads to death. Man's end consists in the full development of his faculties, from the social standpoint, in the organization of the *justitia civilis.* but the organization of a society on the basis of ethical principles or of love is beyond his capacities. The only love which is possible to man is the " eros." We have to recognize therefore that our situation is an impossible one, that we are lost without the help of God. The help of God is the *justificatio impii.*[3] Barth thus revives in its entirety the Reformation doctrine of justification by Faith. In all ethical efforts and in all collaboration with the tasks of culture the best thing is a waiting attitude. In

[1] *Römerbrief,* ii. p. 179. [2] *Römerbrief,* i. A, p. 43.

[3] *Zwischen den Zeiten,* Barth, " Das Problem der Ethik in der Gegenwart," ii. 30, and Gogarten, " Ethik des Gewissens oder Ethik der Gnade," *Zw. den Z.,* ii. 12. " Zum Problem der Ethik," *Zw. d Z.,* iii. 57.

fact everything that man does, even in the highest manifestations of love, is doubtful, problematic, and subject to the wrath of God, who alone knows what is good, and creates it exclusively by His justification of the unjust. Barth admits that he feels here more than elsewhere how hard he has to labour in order to find the unity in his system of paradoxes, where there is little room for the possibility of an ethic beside the omnipotent Grace. But, he holds, the merciful God who forgives us our sins can only be found in the deep distress and despair into which man is brought by his ethical efforts. We are justified by God only as *impii*. And this justification by God is neither visible to men nor expressed by ethical perfection. It is visible only to the eye of Faith.[1] The crux of the question lies in the realization of this truth, that all moral perfection means nothing without the decisive judgment of God.

One may indeed ask how an ethics or even a theology can be founded on a divine grace which is entirely *unanschaulich*, which is no psychic or physical power, no datum of the human experience, but exclusively a crisis between Life and Death. The emphasis which is put in this exclusive way on the divine Grace is an element inherent in the great doctrine of Sin and Grace in Luther as well as in Calvin. Barth stresses more the Calvinistic aspect of this doctrine by giving a new estimate of Predestination, whilst his friend Gogarten [2] maintains the genuinely Lutheran position. The whole group reopens the discussion of four centuries which debates the Lutheran and the Calvinistic conceptions of the Reformation,[3] not in the line of a new *formula concordiæ*, but with the intention of bringing out as sharply as

[1] v. R. Bultmann, "Problem der Ethik bei Paulus," *Ztsch. f. neut. Wissenschaft*, 1/2. 24.

[2] *Die religiöse Entscheidung.* Diederichs, Jena. *Ethik des Gewissens und Ethik der Gnade.* Von Glauben und Offenbarung.

[3] Barth, *Wort Gottes*, p. 179.

possible each separate standpoint. It seems as if Barth considers the Calvinistic conception as a consequence and later fruit of the deeper and more central ideas of Luther, when he says that it would be well for many Reformed people to go back first to Luther [1] and to his fundamental understanding of Sin and Grace. At any rate the Reformed Spirit at least in its Western expression, by stressing the moral law and the social activities, was more in danger of secularizing the gospel and betraying it to the manifold complex of Christian social endeavours. A social Christianism is of course an impossibility where the Church is considered as a Power of Death and where all social attempts are judged as futile before the only necessary thing: to wait for God.[2]

This theology is no doubt at the present time a very influential movement in Continental theology. A small but extremely aggressive group of younger theologians is spreading the new ideas, especially in Germany and Switzerland. Already this influence is felt in Hungary and Holland. *Barth* is their leader in the work of fundamental exegesis, and in the critical revision of the old positions. *Gogarten*, on the Lutheran side, gives the more philosophic aspect of the whole movement. *Brunner* is the systematic theologian of the group; he opposes the Word of God to all subjective and mystic conceptions and attacks Schleiermacher as the father of all this modern heresy.[3] *Thurneysen* collaborates with his friend Barth in the field of practical Church work. He has not only published a very good book on Dostojewsky, but also a collection of sermons, together with Barth,[4] and published a pedagogical course.[5]

[1] Barth, *Wort Gottes*, p. 211.
[2] "Der Christ in der Gesellschaft," in *Wort Gottes*, p. 33.
[3] Emil Brunner, *Die Mystik und das Wort*. J. C. B. Mohr, Tübingen.
[4] *Komm Schöpfer Geist!* Kaiser, 1924.
[5] Heft 1, *Zwischen den Zeiten*.

It is almost impossible to weigh this new theology in a neutral and objective way. It rebukes every objective judgment and demands a decision, a crisis. This theology of crisis contains certainly the strongest criticism of a Christianity which is proud of correct doctrine, social activity, institutional enterprises, love, faith, and ethical efforts, but which lacks the essential, i.e. the crisis through which all these good things have to pass, unless they are to become worthless before the living God.

Now, it is a very grave accusation, that modern Christianity has betrayed the message of the gospel to the culture of this world and, by its relativism, has entirely lost the notion of the Absolute. But the dialectic of this theology preserves it from drawing the conclusion that asceticism is the only possibility left. The value of culture in itself is not denied. Only, it has to pass through Death if God is to meet man. Modern protestantism is specially condemned for its historicism, psychologism, and ethics built on the mere data of conscience. In fact, Kant and Schleiermacher are explicitly attacked. Kant and the whole German idealism have built their systems on the principle of autonomy. The question arises indeed how there is room for God's sovereignty if this principle of autonomy is stressed. A culture based exclusively on it can no more claim to be Christian. It is a merit of the dialectic theology to have drawn again our attention to the danger which modern protestantism has not escaped, of mingling the aims of the transcendent God with the elements of our worldly culture. "My Kingdom is not of this world," said Jesus, and no theology should forget these words. But even if we admit that the task of theology cannot be to find a synthesis between God and world, between religion and culture, even if we might not object to the thesis that religion has always the function of being the crisis of all

culture, can we live and work with a good conscience in the midst of a world where God can in no way be found, and where God's will can in no way be done? If God is removed so far away from this world, if He is beyond all human understanding, then we are again very near old Deism, although we have to admit that the earnestness with which dialectic theology puts the question of God before us cannot be compared with the untroubled quietness of the religious consciousness in the time of Deism. The idea of Creation is almost entirely overshadowed by the idea of Redemption, and a dialectic theologian could not point to the lilies of the field and the sparrows under the sky and read in their glory and freedom the signs of God's providence and presence in the process of this world. On the other hand, if culture is so totally void of all divine guidance and inspiration, and entirely opposed to God's hidden aim, then the danger is approaching that culture is again considered as having its own immanent laws which have nothing to do with God's will. Although not so much in dead earnest as Barth and his friends, Naumann came a few years ago to this conclusion when he could no longer discover God's guidance in the process of the world. The discovery was detrimental to his religion and to his influence. But nevertheless the thesis that religion is the deathblow to all culture and that all religion has to pass through the critical Divine question, will no more be so easily forgotten. Hermann has already taken the same position, though in a less paradoxical way.

In so far as Barth and his friends rediscover Paulinism, although in a form which is sharply questioned, this theology is renewing the radicalism of the Reformation and its great accents on Sin and Grace. It is refreshing to see how this theology goes straightforward into this Holy of holies of the Reformers without looking to the right or the left.

God alone !—be it that His sovereignty is more accentuated as in Barth's position, or His grace in the Lutheran Gogarten, —this is the ground on which the fathers of the Reformation stood. Nevertheless the question arises, were they able to build up their work on this basis ? The Luther who built his Church was not quite the same as the young monk who made the tremendous discovery of the reality of Sin and Grace and who wrote *De servo arbitrio*, a work which has just been re-edited by Gogarten. Only a constant watchfulness, and very strong sense of responsibility, will preserve this exclusion of the human will from a fatal consequence, namely, from a paralysis of the ethical effort. Although we would admit that the merely ethical conception of Christianity falls too short, religious education cannot ignore this element, and this educational task of the Church cannot be abolished, in spite of Barth's protest, without serious dangers—dangers which a young theology has not yet had to face, but which were well known to elder generations.

Indeed the ethical problem is the weak point of the whole position. It is presupposed that the Gospel has not only to do with men of religious genius like Luther, but with ordinary men who go step by step and understand things slowly. Now, one is always tempted to ask how the man in the street could understand such a theology. We never have to ask such a question when we are reading the gospels.

There is no doubt that the critical challenge thrown down by the whole school against modern historicism and psychologism will be heard. The subjective element in religion has indeed put into the background the objective factor of God's first action. Only, we may ask with Harnack [1] whether theology has the same task as the sermon

[1] *Briefwechsel mit Karl Barth.*

or as historical science and how these objective facts which have come to us through history are to be found, set forth and cleansed from the subjective elements which inhere to all tradition. Barth can afford to neglect this question because Jesus, in so far as he is to be found in history, is quite irrelevant for salvation. Christ contains an objective factor which is quite independent of human considerations, historic researches, and psychological explanations. The emphasis laid on this objective divine element is far from leading to a simple restatement of supernaturalism. It is meant to deliver the different theological schools from the nutshells of their opinions and party interests and to concentrate all their aims on the essential content of the gospel. It seeks to deliver orthodoxy from its claims to have in dogma a direct and absolute knowledge of God's mysteries, and to free liberal theology from its ambition to explain the essential by what is accessory, to interpret the transcendent by mere historical connection. By dissolving its claim to present the Absolute, Religion itself might become free to pursue its human ends. Theological criticism can do its work without being afraid to attack the mystery of the Revelation which is entirely transcendent, *unanschaulich*, and enters in no way into the field of theological labour. It seems indeed as if a beginning has been made to initiate a new line of discussion, on a higher plane than that on which the former theological schools used to lead their discussions. Indeed orthodox and liberal theologians have already begun to collaborate in this new field. One thing has been remarked, though perhaps suspiciously remarked, by many protestants: the Roman Catholic theology is showing great interest in this newest development of protestant theology, hailing it as one of the most promising aspects of the time. It is quite intelligible that catholics may feel that this objective theology comes very

near to their own system of objective truths independent of all human efforts. Certain utterances in Barth's theology might easily indeed be misinterpreted as an acceptation of the *opus operatum*. There is no room here for entering into such critical considerations. Suffice it to point out where the old theology, orthodox as well as liberal, has directed its attacks and where a most fruitful critical discussion is engaged. The main problem is the old question of the relationship of the transcendence and the immanence of God. Once before in history, a theology stressed exclusively the transcendent factor, namely that of Marcion. No theology of the present day is inclined to give up the immanent factor. That would lead to a conception of history, nature and human destiny entirely void of the animating forces of God. It would represent history as the exclusive field of God's wrath, entirely opposed to the reign of faith where God's Love and Grace are to be found, not as spiritual realities in the ordinary sense, as experimental divine gifts, but as impalpable, unintelligible mysteries. Of course the dialectic theology would answer that the wrath of God is the paradoxical reverse of God's Grace and that both are one. It would be necessary at this point to examine the question how far the dialectic method can be used as a theological method and whether it has not a philosophic element which, not for the first time, has penetrated into theology and done harm to religion. It has indeed the advantage of preventing any theology, including that of Barth himself, from claiming to have an absolute knowledge of God, and they may keep the theologians humble. But the question may be permitted: Did the gospels use this method?

We may expect that the whole group will still have to show how an ethic is possible on such a basis. Of course every true Christian, theologian or layman, lives by Grace

only, and no ethical effort can make us forget the prayer: God be merciful to me, poor sinner! But nevertheless, few men, even few Christians, begin with this experience; a long pedagogic way leads to this summit of Christian experience.

It is therefore difficult to understand how an ethic of conscience can be spared or how the moral law can be replaced by an ethics of grace. As long as we have to face manifold practical tasks in this world we are accompanied by the ethical problem. The new school has still to prove in theology as well as in practical educational work how they solve it.

The dialectic theology does not intend to take the place of any other theology. Its main aim is to add a little "spice" (Kierkegaard) to all theological and ecclesiastical activities which are human, all too human. In so far as it puts the burning question of God anew in the front of all our thinking and living, it deserves the widest attention from the whole theological world and is concerned indeed with the one great and unique problem of theology.

ADOLF KELLER.

THE THIRD COMMANDMENT.

THE third commandment is probably more difficult of interpretation than any of the other nine. We have already been told that Jehovah is a jealous God, who visits the iniquity of the fathers upon the children to the third and fourth generation. It is true that "He sheweth mercy unto thousands that love Him and keep His commandments." But probably the thought uppermost in the minds of the Jews as they studied the Decalogue was rather that of God's punishment than that of His love and mercy. Many have

seen difficulty in this. They are in the habit of thinking that to speak of God's jealousy is to use anthropomorphic language, to bring petty human feelings to the interpretation of the divine life. But is not jealousy a quality which truly, yea, which most truly, describes God's moral nature ? Love is always jealous. Love always ought to be jealous. A good man is jealous of his honour ; it is agony for him to be misunderstood. Jealousy is not the capricious feeling of one who refuses to allow liberty of action to other people : it is the natural outbursting of a love which has felt itself to be insulted and passed over for something less than love.

This being the principle behind the third commandment, it behoves us to try to understand it. We do not know how these commandments were revealed or when precisely they were revealed. It is sufficient for us that they have come down to us, and that, whatever their precise origin historically, they bear upon them the stamp of divine truths. Even, however, if we looked upon them as being miraculously given by God to Moses, without any exercising of his own mind, even then, we should feel compelled to try to understand the thoughts behind them. We should not be content with knowing that these ordinances were right, and that we ought to obey them : we should want to know why they were right, and why we ought to obey them.

How did Israel discover that God was a jealous God ? What put it into her mind that in dealing with Jehovah she was dealing with One who punished an insult ? Israel had come into contact with the gods of other nations, gods of all kinds of moral and immoral qualities, gods of lust and gods of power, gods of hate and gods of revenge. Some of them were cruel and malicious, others were licentious and sensual. They showed the moral qualities of their nations writ large, sanctioning by divine authority the kind of life lived by the peoples over which they ruled.

But they were not jealous. They did not deny the existence of other gods. They did not show themselves to be particularly zealous for the honour of their name. What made the difference with Jehovah? How was it that Israel saw in God what other nations did not see? And what was it precisely that Israel saw?

What it was that Israel saw in God is obvious. They knew Him as the God of right and truth, who loved Israel a good deal, but who loved righteousness a good deal more. God was the supreme Lawgiver. He was the Guardian of public righteousness and national equity. When judges arose in Israel, they were not elected by the people, they were called by God. When warriors triumphed over heathen nations, it was not in their own strength or by the power of their own hand, but because Jehovah was with them. When the judges judged, it was in accordance with laws given on the mount. Jehovah was not merely a God who stood outside the nation and looked at it with a benevolent eye, He was part and parcel of its national life, involved in all its fortunes, dependent for His honour upon its loyalty, as loving as a father, and as majestic as a king. There is no other people that has given us a code like the Ten Commandments, because there is no other people that has thought of God as being so concerned with the personal lives of men and women.

If we ask how Israel came to see the moral qualities in God, how they came to see that He was holy, and jealous for the honouring of His name, there is only one answer that can be given, the old answer that Israel discovered God in their own history. How is it that this obscure tribe of fugitives, driven from Egypt because of their fear of her tyranny, with little knowledge of history, evidently lacking in wide knowledge of the earth and the heavens, with no great thinkers to guide them, ruled by very crude

superstition—how is it that this people of all peoples became the means of giving to the world the purest religion and the noblest morality that man has ever known or ever will know? There must be some reason for it. These things do not happen by accident. Men do not discover God, and they do not know the meaning of life, by some stray chance or happy coincidence. There have been peoples wiser than Israel, peoples more cultured, peoples with a longer history, peoples with a knowledge of science and art—why have they not given to us what Israel has given? I say that it is useless putting it down to accident. Accidents of this nature never happen. The materialistic theory always proves to be unsatisfactory in the face of a concrete instance. Neither is it of much use putting it down to race. Race and family count for a good deal. Heredity is one of the most potent factors in life. Vices and virtues, culture and the lack of it, run in families and nations. The sins of the father had to reproduce themselves in the children. But whatever heredity may account for, it most assuredly does not account for the religion and theology which Israel gave to the world. It took centuries for her to gain her balance after living in the midst of the corruptions of Egypt. She gave way time and time again to the most disgusting and demoralising forms of worship. Her greatest king was a murderer and an adulterer, and the one of most repute for wisdom filled Jerusalem with his wives and their foreign gods. Every new prophet who came forth with his scathing views and passionate oratory, every new warrior who arose to deliver Israel from her enemies, waged the same war, the war against that spirit in Israel which drove her to erect idols on every hillside and under every green tree. When we say that Israel's gift to the world is to be laid down to race, we show a curious ignorance of her history.

There is only one answer. It was God who was behind Israel's history. It was God who was behind these laws. Men may have come to see in many ways that idolatry and murder and theft were wrong. Many experiences can convince us of the error of these actions. But no mere laws can make a nation great. It is a great nation that makes good laws. It needed revelation, the speaking of God in history, to convince Israel that she must not commit murder and practise idolatry. Time and time again, Israel made mistakes, fell from her high altitude and returned to the paganism from which she had sprung. But every time she was punished, and she was wise enough to see in the punishment the hand of God. Calamity and trial come to a good many peoples, but very few are able to see in it God's workings. Israel learned to honour God because she discovered that she had to pay hard and long every time she dishonoured Him.

It must be remembered that these were the laws of the state, beaten out in the history of the race, binding upon the community as well as upon the individual, and to be enforced by the magistrate as the agent of God. To forsake the worship of Jehovah, the God of revelation, the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, was to act treacherously towards the state, to forsake the God who, according to all ancient ideas, was bound up intimately with the life of the nation, and, therefore, to commit an act of political folly. To forsake the pure spiritual worship of Jehovah, and to worship Him under some material form, was to make terms with the surrounding peoples on the question of idolatry. Religious intolerance was necessary to the pure life of Israel. To meet the neighbouring states in matters of religion was to commit treason against the supreme Magistrate, who was God. To do dishonour to God's name, to regard an oath made in His name as one to be easily broken, was to deny

the principle of fidelity to the plighted word, which lies at the basis of all sound government.

I.

Among nearly all ancient peoples, a man's name was regarded as being possessed of a peculiar significance. It is very much the same among uncivilised peoples to-day. The study of names is one the importance of which simply cannot be overestimated in the examination of early religion and morality. Many scholars have devoted years of research to it, and have gathered together from all parts of the world a wealth of material which is invaluable to the student of religion. I cannot enter at all into detail in such a series of lectures as this, but for the sake of making myself clear, and in order to show a little of the reverence that the Hebrews attached to the name Jehovah, I should just like to summarise the results of research into the names of primitive peoples. The following four points are the most important for our immediate purpose.

(1) The ceremony of conferring the name upon a newly-born child was one of outstanding importance. It was thought by many that the child could possess no personality, and, therefore, no rights and obligations, until the name had been given. Thus, sometimes, in order to constitute a child into a personality, a provisional name was given to it at birth, purely for practical purposes, and its proper name was given to it much later, when it began to show some definite moral or physical characteristics. In exactly the same way, every God had to have His name. Originally, Jehovah was the personal name of the God of Israel, just as Joseph is a personal name.

(2) Nearly always, the name given to a child was chosen because of some particular circumstances attending its birth or to typify some particular aspiration in the minds

of the parents. Right down even to the eighteenth century, even with Christian people, there was a certain amount of superstition over names. It was thought of as an act of piety or as ensuring divine grace to give a child the name of some Biblical hero or heroine. Nowadays, there seems to be no system at all about the giving of names. A name is chosen as a compliment to a relative, or because the parents happen to fancy it, or because it is the fashionable name at the time, or because some famous person bearing it has just died.

(3) A man's name was very often changed because of some event of outstanding significance. Parents sometimes changed their names upon the birth of their first child, or upon the death of a child, or to commemorate some striking event or piece of good or bad fortune.

(4) In the case of spirits, demons and gods, to know the name and to be able properly to incant it, was to be possessed of great power. In the uncivilised world, spirit-raising, exorcism, sorcery and all other forms of magic depend, to a very great extent, upon the proper handling of names. Men can offer no commands to the occupants of the spirit world with any hope of receiving obedience, unless they can pronounce their names properly, and on the other hand, if properly addressed, the spirits have difficulty in escaping the commands laid upon them.

Those four principles are enough for our purpose, as all I wish to do is to throw a little light upon the attitude to the name of God which is reflected in the third commandment.

When this commandment was given, the name of anyone connoted something. It was not a mere sign or label to distinguish one person from another. It represented some lofty ambition, some moral quality, some great work or some physical peculiarity. Thus we are told that the son

of Abraham and Sarah was named Isaac to perpetuate the memory of the glad surprise of the parents at the birth of the child. Jacob's name was changed to Israel, the prince or warrior of God, because he had struggled for a night with the angel of God at the brook Jabbok. One warrior may have been called Gideon because he was maimed, and another man may have been called Nabal because he was something of a fool.

In exactly the same way, the name Jehovah was more than a name. It did more than distinguish the God of Israel from the gods of other nations. It defined Him. It summed up, as it were, the secrets of His revelation to Israel. If God was to reveal Himself, and if men were to show that they read and understood the revelation, some name had to be given to Him, to show what He was and how He had acted. Just as when men passed through some new and remarkable experience, they were given or gave themselves a new name to perpetuate the memory of it, so when God seized the opportunity of revealing Himself in a fuller manner, He was given a new name. The name of God stands for what God is, what His nature is, what He has revealed Himself in history to be. The name of God is holy, because God is holy. It is a crime to take the name of God in vain because it is a crime to utter profanity against, or to do dishonour to, God. If I am to know God, I have to know what He does and how He reveals Himself. I have to know His acts and His words. I have to bring my life into line with His. I have to obey His commands and love His law. When we see that, in the course of history, prophets and seers have given better and better names to God, we have the right to assume that He has been gradually revealing Himself, until men have known more and more of His heart.

To judge by the names given to God in the Old Testament,

many of them had their origin in a frank paganism. What the precise origin was may be uncertain, but analogy makes it very probable that, when God is spoken of as the Rock, the Fortress, the High Tower, the Lord of Hosts, the Most High, the name goes back, through many centuries, to the time when He was regarded as the God of a particular tribe, closely linked to some physical feature in the land. But by the time that Israel comes into the clear light of history, origins have been forgotten, and the comparison of God to a rock or a stone or anything else material is only symbolic and refers definitely to ethical qualities. To the patriarchs, God was known as Shaddai, the storm God or the sun God or perhaps the mountain God, pointing to the fact that they were drawn to believe in Him by the power and violence of natural forces. When God was revealed to Moses, it was as Jehovah that He made Himself known. When Christ spoke to men of God, He taught them to say Father, and everything good and true is taken up in that name. This revelation of God is not something deliberate or spectacular: it is something as quiet and grand as the moving of the stars on high. It is not a series of events got up for show, engineered for man's sake, but with which he has little vitally to do. It is a revelation to the heart and to the mind and to the conscience of man, in his successes and in his defeats, in his joys and in his sorrows, in his vigour and in his weakness, so that, by the logic of facts and life, he is forced to see that somewhere there is a destiny shaping his ends, rough-hew them how he will.

Israel always knew God as the God of revelation. Scripture never attempts to prove the existence of God; it always assumes Him as a fact. It never enters into the minds of the writers of it that ordinary men would deny His existence. If there were men who denied it, or who professed that

they knew nothing of it, it was because they were so sunken in sin that the light of knowledge had passed from their minds. Their ignorance was due to the depravity of their hearts rather than the incompetence of their heads. Then again it is assumed in the Bible, not only that God is, and not only that men may know that He is : it is assumed further that we may know Him for ourselves, read His mind, know His purpose, and discover His will. A man is known by what he does and what he says, by his life in the home, by his worship in the church, by his conduct in business, by his work in the state, and by his daily companionship with others. God is known by what He does and says, by His life in the world, by His actions in history, by His ruling of nature, and by His fellowship with men. He is neither known nor unknown, but ever becoming better known.

There have been long controversies over the cogency of the proofs for the existence of God. Preachers have used their eloquence, and philosophers have employed their learning to build up a tremendous edifice of proof which reaches up to the stars. But the Bible does not search for proofs. It grew up in the atmosphere of certainty. All the great saints spoke of God out of a full heart and a confident assurance. They would sooner have denied the existence of the world or of themselves than have denied the existence of God.

The God of the Bible is the God of nature. Philosophers may argue and poets may wrangle over the precise arguments that can be derived from nature as to the meaning of ultimate reality, but ordinary men and women of simple faith are quite satisfied to take the world as they find it, as pointing clearly enough to a great Creator. They stand upon the mountainside in the cool of the evening, and gaze into the immeasurable depths of the sky ; they hear the

surging of the seas and the beating of the waves upon the shore; they see the wonder of things in the fragrance of the spring flowers, in the song of the summer birds, and in the tints of the autumn leaves; they find their hearts stirred within them as they watch the sun creeping up or sinking down behind the purple heights; they find themselves led into the broad spaces where their souls can rest, as they think of the mighty continents and the eternal hills. They would rather believe in all the legends of Arabia than believe that these things could be without a God.

The God of the Bible is the God of history. It is He who redeemed Israel from destruction, and cut off Pharaoh in his pride. He is the God of the eternities, the eternity of the past and the eternity of the future.

What the name Jehovah means definitely, it is very hard to say. When it first became known to Israel, it is equally hard to say. But if we are to interpret the name by how it was interpreted in the history of the Jewish nation, our task is much easier. The name Jehovah was taken to mean that God is what He has always been and will always be what He is. Israel had had enough in her past history to put the nature of God beyond doubt. Their fathers had loved and served Him, and He had been with them in all their distresses. He had been their God in ages past, and so they knew that He would be their hope in years to come. Abraham had gone out of an idolatrous city into a land where he was not known. He had had trouble over his wife, and had had trouble with his relatives. He had had many trials and disappointments, and had not always shown himself strong enough to bear with them. Generations had passed since then, and much water had flowed along the River Nile. But slowly the children of Abraham had been consolidated into a nation, and now, as they

looked back, they saw how God had led them. It is only peoples whose liberal outlook is balanced by a sensible conservatism which are destined to survive long in the conflict of the nations. It is only as they realise that their institutions have been given to them by the courage and sagacity and foresight of long generations of ancestors, that they will show themselves wise and farsighted in sowing the seed the fruit of which succeeding generations will reap. In days of excessive individualism (and most days of fresh thought and outlook are such), the formative influences of history are easily forgotten. Men play fast and loose with their heritage in their burning passion for something new. There is much which can well call forth objection in the religious and political life of our own country, just as there was in Israel much that could be changed, much that could be put upon the scrap-heap, but the more we look at it, the more we have to respect its strength and wisdom. Through endless generations, God has been building up the great nations of the earth, making their names to be feared by the cruel and the greedy, framing their laws from barbarous origins, until they become worthy of being honoured and obeyed. No nation can be called great until it realises the sanctity of its past and the sanctity of its future. When a nation can view God as Israel viewed Jehovah, and see in Him the One who holds the past and the present and the future in His grasp, that nation has set its feet on the path that goes towards greatness.

That the name of Jehovah was regarded as of particular sanctity in Israel can be seen by the history of the Hebrew Bible. It was looked upon with reverence and even with superstitious awe. It is said that the Jews kept the name Jehovah as a treasured secret to themselves, and never used it in their intercourse with foreign peoples. Even among themselves it passed more and more into disuse. The

pronunciation "Jehovah" is certainly wrong. It was not introduced into general usage until the year 1520 A.D., through the agency of Petrus Galatinus, Confessor of Pope Leo X. It is a mongrel word, formed of the consonants of one name for God and the vowels of another. In reading the ancient scriptures, in order to safeguard themselves against pronouncing the personal name for God, whenever it occurred, they substituted for it another name, Adonai, which means "My Lord," and which was regarded as less awful and therefore less dangerous. Hebrew used to be written without vowels, and it was only well on in the Christian era, when the knowledge of Hebrew was passing out, that the vowel sounds were introduced in order to preserve the ancient pronunciation. In the case of the name for God, in order to safeguard the readers of the scripture against carelessly speaking it, the vowels of the word Adonai were attached to the consonants of the sacred name, thus making the combination of letters which is pronounced Jehovah. Tradition says that the proper pronunciation of the name lingered for a long time with the priests, when it passed from the knowledge of ordinary men.

The name of God is becoming too sacred for mention even in Biblical times. It is avoided in most of the late books of the Old Testament. In Amos we find the idea that it is dangerous to mention God's name. And in some of the Psalms, where the personal name of God originally stood, it has been removed, and the abstract name Elohim or Deity substituted for it.

II.

We all think of God: we cannot help it. The thought may be wise or it may be foolish. It may have much ground for it, or it may have none. We may think about God with the endeavour of understanding Him, or we may

think about Him with the intention of denying Him, but think about Him we do, and think about Him we must. With the belief in God the Bible starts, and with no less a belief in Him does it end. All religion begins in Him, the end of all religion is to be like Him, and the goal of all thinking is to understand Him. The belief in God may be due to a number of causes. It may be a tradition, handed down through the ages and accepted by us without question. We may accept God as calmly and naturally as we accept birth and death. We may believe in Him because the constitution of the world forces us to do so, or because our hearts prompt us to do so, or because our conscience drives us to do so, or, if we are superstitious, we may accept God in the same way that we accept ghosts. But for whatever reason we think of Him, and in whatever way we think of Him, we cannot help thinking, and the way we think affects vitally our whole attitude to life.

Of course, there are many people who say that they know nothing of God. The usual resort at the present time for those men and women who object to the ordinary teaching of the Christian Church is found in the mental attitude which goes by the name Agnostic. Naturally, all men are agnostics in some sense. We all confess that there are facts of which we can know nothing. The Christian of the twentieth century, whose one great object in life is to do the will of God, and who thankfully acknowledges redemption through the life and death of Jesus Christ, yet confesses that he can never fully know God, that His depths are unsearchable and His ways past finding out.

Agnosticism is by no means a product of the modern world. Since the days of the Sophists in Greece, there have been constantly recurring periods of Atheism and Agnosticism; generally as a protest against prevailing religious conceptions. But since the days of Huxley and

Herbert Spencer, who tried to show that Agnosticism was not only felt by men, but ought to be felt by them, this negative attitude with regard to religion has become the usual resting place for those who have felt compelled to break away from the Christian Church. Scientists especially, some of whom talk learnedly about the certainties of knowledge of the physical world, and who are filled with wonder at the easy way in which the majority of people can be gulled in the matters of religion, take up the position of Agnosticism. They are in the habit of dealing with what they call hard facts, facts which they can see and measure and weigh, and as God can be neither seen nor measured nor weighed they jump to the melancholy conclusion that He cannot be known at all.

There are, of course, two classes of agnostics. Those among them who are modest merely confess ignorance. They say that the case is not proven. They do not deny that God can be known. They merely say that they themselves do not know Him, that they have made their investigations carefully and honestly, and have come across nothing which casts light upon the meaning of His person. They make no emphatic denial, they merely confess ignorance.

But some agnostics go further than that. They pass from the expression of scientific ignorance to dogmatic denial. They go further than saying that they themselves do not know God. They go so far as to say that they cannot know Him and that, moreover, nobody else can know Him. They tell us that it is impossible for the finite to grasp the infinite. They point to our developing knowledge of the physical world. Men are pushing their investigations into every corner and cranny of the world, plumbing the seas, disembowelling the earth, and rising high above the clouds, opening up afresh the closed pages of the past, and opening out before us the even more closed

pages of the future. Everywhere, they are starting from what they know to discover what they do not know. And all along the line, they are coming across hard fact and solid certainty. Knowledge which our fathers even, let alone our grandfathers, would have considered impossible, is, in many cases, the common property of school children, and actions which they would have regarded as flying in the face of Providence are the everyday events of our modern life. The physical world is becoming daily a more open book. But when scientists endeavour to get beyond what they can see and touch to the unseen God, they feel that they are working in the dark, and they confess that they have often to come back with empty hands.

But scientists are not alone among agnostics. Doubt seems to spread more rapidly than faith. Sin is doomed to final destruction, but, for the time being, it holds its head aloft with more confidence than does truth. Among ordinary people, who make no pretensions to knowledge, and who have nothing of what we call science, agnosticism is more rampant than at some times it appears to be. We often grumble at the bad state of religious life, and the little ethical originality that is being manifested by the majority of men and women to-day, but I often wonder whether we realise how much of it springs from lack of religious faith. There are so many things which make the knowledge of God difficult. How much do we know about ourselves ? We think thoughts and dream dreams which are staggering in their unexpectedness. For most of us, life is fairly placid, and little of the marvellous happens inside our minds, but now and again, we have flashes, like a single flash of lightning at midnight, which show us that we are living on the very edge of a volcano. A leading mental expert has set it on record that, in his opinion, sanity is a matter of degree, and that all of us have something

of insanity in us. And that verdict can be vindicated by most of us in our own experience. How much do we know of our friends, our children, our parents, our husbands, our wives ? We know their words and deeds, but what do we know of their thoughts, the desires that agitate their minds ? Shadows are cast across the face of God from many quarters. Taking average, ordinary human life, it is remarkable how some people stand up against it. There are many homes in which only one pair of hands stands between the family and starvation, there is the sudden failure in business, the marriage turned into a mockery, the daughter gone to shame. These things cannot but react upon men's conception of God.

Concessions have to be made to the agnostic position, and the man or woman of reverence and knowledge is always ready to make them. There is nothing more damaging to religious life than the easy familiar attitude to God that is shown by some people. There is a great deal in the thought of Puritanism that we can be glad has passed from the world, its hatred of art, and its destructive tendency towards many of the more delicate instincts. But one element in the Puritan outlook that we could copy with advantage is its attitude to God. Puritans never forgot that in dealing with God, they were dealing with the High and Lofty One, who inhabiteth the eternities. The best terms of earth fall far short when applied to God. Even the term Father, in so far as it connotes elements of passion and physical relationship, has to be modified when applied to Him. Our highest notions come short of the reality. A God whom we could perfectly measure and comprehend would be totally inadequate for our needs. A God whom we could fully understand could never redeem us. The very name of God must be great enough to bring us to our knees, and make us to be lost in wonder, love and praise.

The Bible supports us here. "Canst thou by searching find out God?" "O, the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and the knowledge of God. How unsearchable are His judgments, and His ways past finding out." In that sense, we are all agnostics.

But it is one thing to say that we cannot know everything about God, and quite another thing to say that we cannot know anything. The one confession comes from reverent fear, the other from dogmatic conceit. Agnosticism is an easy way out of a difficulty. God is evidently hard to understand. Contradictions seem to be part and parcel of the Most High. He eludes the grasp of our subtlest thoughts, and is always beyond us in our most patient investigations. It is an easy way to untie a knot by cutting it. But when we look at the agnostic position, we see that what is regarded as an easy solution has really made confusion worse confounded.

In the first place, paradoxical as it may sound, to declare that God cannot be known is to assert that you already know a good deal about Him. It is sometimes said that Agnosticism is nothing more than a negative position, nothing more than a declaration of what the sceptic professes to disbelieve. But all denials rest upon belief, and if we dispute one statement, it is because we rely upon the truth of another. The agnostic has to acknowledge that he knows enough about God to declare that He cannot be known. To say that God *is not* known is to say a good deal. For it is to say that both you and all the other millions on the earth have made their investigations, and have found no trace of God, no mark of His footsteps, no echo of His speech. To say even that much is to lay claim to more knowledge than most modest men would claim to possess. But to say that God *cannot* be known is to go twice as far. It is to say that you have read to the bottom

of God's secret, and discovered that it cannot be read.

Then, again, to declare that God cannot be known is to say that God cannot make Himself known, that the Bible is all nonsense, and that the very idea of revelation is a figment of the imagination. Apart altogether from the part that millions joyfully acknowledge that God has played in their own life, to assert dogmatically that God is unable to enter into communication with men is a daring assertion and a hopeless contradiction. It means that we know all about man, know his possibilities, have read his past, and can predict his future. It means that no man, in any period of the world's history, no matter whether he was as wise as Plato or as strong as Cæsar or as noble as Jesus, has ever entered into fellowship with God. It means that all the experiences of the saints are only delusions. Have we measured the resources of the Almighty? Have we searched every corner of the heavens, and trod every spot of earth, and read every word of the wise and felt the throbbing passion of every prophet, and heard the music and seen the beauty of every man of art, and found that not with a single one of them, has God spoken to men? We must have done all that, before we can be so bold as to deny that God can be known to men.

But the most important thing is that no man is a mere scientist or philosopher, even though many try to be. No man is without a conscience, the sense of unconditional obligation. No man can pass many days without having a voice which speaks in his heart as loudly and insistently as the last trumpet at the crack of doom, a voice which says, "Thou shalt," and "Thou shalt not," and which will not be gainsaid. None of us can guarantee ourselves against condemnation in a judgment within us, which is as final as though it were the judgment of God. God is met with in the heart of each man, In our own inner life,

He speaks to us. We have a voice convicting us of failure, and yet informing us that from that failure, we can be redeemed. But then we know with a certainty that no preconceived philosophic or scientific ideas can shake, that in this voice which has spoken in our heart, we have met God. It is not that we argue from the voice to God: it is rather that we suddenly discover that God's living spirit somehow indwells us, and subdues us to Himself. God has His evidence stamped upon all those who have been touched by the thoughts of better things. Put in the heart of each of us is a spark from the flame of the Eternal, a light lighted from Him who shineth ever more and more unto the perfect day. To accustom ourselves to the burning of that light and to allow it to have daily an increased power is the object of every Christian man. God is His own guarantee, in the growing clearness with which He speaks to all those who endeavour to do His Will. The Spirit of God testifieth within our spirits that we are sons of God.

God is known in the same way as men are known, by what He does and what He says. To believers, He is never a mere name or a collection of attributes. They do not argue to Him as the necessary cause of the universe or confuse Him with the Absolute. The Jews knew God because they had found Him in the facts of their own national life. He it was who had rescued them from Egypt and made them free ; He it was who had driven back the waves of the sea by a strong east wind, so that they could cross over in safety ; He it was who had raised up deliverers for them continually, and saved them from the vengeance of their enemies. They knew God, not from theological disquisitions on the divine nature, but from the facts of a divine history.

The Christian has met God in Christ. He knows God from what Christ has said and done, and from what He

still says and does. What it is to be found of God every Christian knows. We feel His touch, and there is no doubt as to whose hand is touching us. We hear His voice, and we know that it is He Who speaks. A power rests upon us, and we need none to tell us that God is near. A light shines, and we know that the winter is ended and the night is passed. We may never have read a book of philosophy. Science may be a closed book to us. The creeds may be a riddle to us. But to us God is like what we see in Christ. We know him to be the Father of one who healed the sick, cleansed the leper, forgave sinners, comforted the widow, blessed little children, suffered on a cross, and proved the victor over death. And with that we are satisfied.

H. J. Flowers.

(*To be continued.*)

SOME NOTES ON NAHUM I.–II. 3.

The saintly Bishop King is reported to have remarked in a sermon [1] that "there was so much to explore in the Books of the Old Testament if we could give time to books mostly so little known. *Now Nahum!*" The good Bishop would have put even more emphasis into this proposition if he could have foreseen the complicated questions arising as to this book, especially with regard to chapters i.–ii. 3, and the theories which have in later years been put forth on the subject. It will be the object of this essay to consider some of these questions and examine some of these theories.

(*a*) The Home of Nahum.

This prophet is described as "the Elkoshite." [2] Some

[1] *The Mind and Work of Bishop King*, by Randolph and Townroe, p. 83.

[2] הָאֶלְקֹשִׁי

have thought this a patronymic, but this does not seem to be so. While many of the prophets are characterised by the names of their fathers, as Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, Joel, Zephaniah, and others, some are spoken of by their place of residence as Ahijah of Shiloh (1 Kings xi. 29), Elijah of Tishbe (1 Kings xviii. 1), Micah of Moresheth (Micah i. 1, Jer. xxvi. 18), Hananiah of Gibeon (Jer. xxviii. 1). Here the word looks more like a gentile than a patronymic form,[1] and we may translate "Nahum of Elkosh." But where was Elkosh? There are three entirely different traditions on this subject which must be in turn examined.

1. The first claimant is *Alkush*, a little town on the Tigris not far from Mosul (Nineveh), where there is a monument known as "Nahum's tomb," held in reverence by both Mohammedans and Christians but especially by Jews, who keep the building in repair and flock there in great numbers at certain seasons of the year.[2] The tradition which connects Nahum with this place was not known to European scholars till the sixteenth century, although it was probably much older. It is found in a letter written to Rome by one Andrew Masius, giving an account of the election of a patriarch of Chaldea, Joannes Sulaca. This priest at the time of election was the head of a monastery known as Rabban-Hormisd, which is stated to be about 8,000 paces from Nineveh and 2,000 from *Alcus* the country of Nahum and the site of his famous monument.[3] This identification was favoured by Ewald[4] on the ground of the prophet's knowledge of Assyrian affairs. He thought that his descrip-

[1] *Ges.-K.* 86, h. [2] Layard. quot. Davidson, *Camb. Bible*, p. 10.

[3] "Quod contubernium Rabban-Hormisd appellatur abestque millibus passuum fere octo ab Ninivo. At ab *Alcus* patria Nahum prophetæ etiam nunc hujus monumento tam Judeis quam Christianis celebratissima (o) non amplius duobus passuum millibus." Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.* i. 525.

"In benedicto oppido *Alcus* in patria scilicet Nahum prophetæ." *Ib.*, iii. 352, n. 2.

[4] *Propheten, E.T.*, iii. 2.

tion of things in that kingdom was so vivid that it would seem as if he must himself have seen them all, and as dwelling not far from Nineveh must have taken the deepest interest in its fortunes. It is certainly true that Nahum does display a very accurate knowledge of the topography of Nineveh and of the political and military conditions of the Assyrian realm. In fact, chapters ii. and iii. can be, and have been, copiously elucidated from Assyrian monuments and literary records.[1] It cannot be doubted that at some time or other he had visited the place.[2] But this by no means renders it necessary to assume that he was born or was resident there. If he had been, it is not easy to see how his book could ever have found its way into the Jewish Canon. We think that there are sufficient indications in this book to show that Nahum was a prophet of Judah. In i. 9 and i. 11 there seems to be a clear allusion to the expedition of Sennacherib (2 Kings xviii. f.), and the beautiful address to Judah (i. 15, Heb. ii. 1) seems to require an author who knew her mountains and loved her feasts, while the "Belial" who is not to pass through her any more is certainly the Assyrian. It is not without significance that this verse is quoted by the great Judean prophet of the exile (Isa. lii. 7). This Chaldean tradition is late and entitled to little credit, and the legend of the tomb is of no more value than that which connects Jonah with the mound of *Neby Iunnus* within the walls of Nineveh,[3] or that of *Ezra's Tomb* which is shown to travellers sailing on the Tigris.

2. A second tradition, reported by Eusebius[4] and Jerome[5]

[1] See Billerbeck and Jeremias, "Der Untergang Ninevehs, etc.," *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, iii. 1, pp. 96–106.

[2] *Ib.*, p. 92. [3] *Ib.*, p. 92 and Map II.

[4] "*Elcese* de quo loco et Naum propheta fuit nam adpellatur Elkesœus." Lagarde, *Onom.*, 2nd ed., pp. 153, 262.

[5] "*Elcesi*, usque hodie in Galilea viculus sit parvus quidem et vix ruinis veterum ædificiorum indicans vestigia—sed tamen notus Judeis et

places the home of the prophet at *Elkese* or *Elkesi*, a little village in Galilee with some remains of ancient ruins, but well known to the Jews and pointed out to Jerome by his guide as the home of Nahum. This seems to be the Palestinian tradition, and it was accepted by Pusey,[1] who remarks that Nahum's mention of Bashan Carmel and Lebanon (i. 4) perhaps implies a special interest in North Israel. It might possibly be inferred from the name of Capernaum (כְּפַר נָחוּם village of Nahum), St. Matthew iv. 13, that a tradition did exist of the prophet's connection with Galilee.[2] There are, however, great difficulties in the way of this tradition. The destruction of the kingdom of the Ten Tribes and the admixture of foreign elements in its population (2 Kings xvii. 24 f.) produced a religious atmosphere in which it was almost impossible that a prophet like Hosea could arise, and, in fact, we hear of no north-country prophet after his time. This was especially the case in Galilee where there had always been a strong foreign element in the population, so that it was named "Galilee of the heathen" (Isa. ix. 1, viii. 13, Heb.). Since the inroad of the Scythians this foreign element seems to have been augmented, as these invaders had built a city, Scythopolis, on the site of the ancient Beth Shan and had held their ground in that neighbourhood.[3] From such a district and in such times of confusion as followed the fall of Samaria, we can hardly think it likely that a prophet of the Northern tribes would emerge, certainly not a prophet with strong Judean sympathies such as we see Nahum display. We do not doubt that Jerome faithfully reported what his

mihi quoque a circumducente monstratus." Hieron. Opp., ed. Vallarsi, vi. 533.

[1] *Minor Prophets*, iv. 357.

[2] Billerbeck-Jeremias, p. 94; Davidson, p. 12.

[3] See Jud. i. 27 LXX.; Herod. i. 105; Ewald, *Gesch.*, *E.T.*, iv. 231, v. 99.

guide told him, but the tradition does not gain much strength from the very vague reference of Eusebius, and we cannot forget that another tradition of earlier date was current in Palestine—that out of Galilee arises no prophet (St. John vii. 52).

3. Another tradition is preserved in a tract, "Concerning the prophets, where they died, and where they lie buried," which is found among the works of Epiphanius, who was Bishop of Constantia (Salamis) in 367. The text is very corrupt, and of the part relating to Nahum there are three recensions. The first runs, "He was from *Elkesi* beyond the Jordan towards *Begabar* of the tribe of Simeon." [1] A second runs, "Nahum, a son of Elkesaios, was from *Jasbe* of the tribe of Symeon," [2] and the third is "Nahum was from *Elkesem* beyond *Betabarem* of the tribe of Symeon." [3] It is not easy to discern the true form of the place-names from these confused texts, but it is to be noticed that they all place the town they name in the tribe of Simeon, and that therefore "beyond the Jordan" is clearly an error.

Two other recensions have been published by E. Nestle, one in Greek as follows, "Nahum from *Elkese* beyond *Is Begabaron* of the tribe of Symeon," and one in Syriac which runs, "Nahum was from *Alqush* beyond *Beth Gabre* of the tribe of Simeon." [4] It is, we think, generally agreed that this Syrian version gives the true text, and it points to a known place—*Bethogabra*. This town is not named in the Old Testament, but Josephus alludes to it as captured by

[1] Οὗτος ἦν ἀπὸ Ἐλκεσὶ πέραν τοῦ Ιορδάνου εἰς βηγαβὰρ ἐκ φυλῆς Σιμεών.

[2] Ναοὺμ υἱὸς Ἐλκεσαίου ἦν ἀπὸ Ἰεσβῆ φυλῆς Συμειών.

[3] Ναοὺμ ἦν ἀπὸ Ἐλκεσὲμ πέραν τοῦ βηταβαρὴμ φυλῆς Συμεών. Migne, *Patrologia*, Vol. 44, pp. 410, 417.

[4] Ναοὺμ ἀπὸ Ἐλκεσὲ πέραν τοῦ Ισβεγαβερὸν φυλῆς Συμεών.

ܢܚܘܡ ܐܠܟܫ ܥܠ ܥܒܪ ܝܘܪܕܢ ܒܬ ܓܒܪ ܒܝܬ ܐܠ ܕܡܢ ܫܒܛ ܫܡܥܘܢ

Nestle, *Marginalien u. Materialen*, pp. 26, 44.

Vespasian [1] and it is named in the Talmud as *Beth Gubrin.*[2] It is identical with Eleutheropolis, now Beth Djibrin, some twenty miles north-west of Hebron, where there remain some not unimportant ruins.[3] This is a very likely place to be the residence of a Jewish prophet. Here would be preserved vivid memories of the Assyrian invasion under Sennacherib and of the occupation of the country by his terrible armies. Not far from here had twice marched Assyrian armies on their way to Egypt. Such memories may well account for the fierce hatred which Nahum felt towards the Assyrian power. In weighing this tradition, it is worthy of note that Epiphanius was a native of a village near Eleutheropolis,[4] and (if he be the author of the work referred to) would have learned the tradition on the spot. On the whole this tradition is in harmony with all the indications to be derived from the prophet's book, and we are of opinion that it may be accepted as authentic.

4. Another suggestion, made by Happel in his queer paradoxical book,[5] may be mentioned here as a curiosity of criticism. According to this writer there never was any such place as Elkosh nor any gentile name Elkoshite. The word arose in this way. The original poem underlying chapter i. began (as did also the edited poem) with אל El, God, v. 2, and concluded with קש Kashins, stubble, v. 10. As this only included a part of Nahum's original poem, the editor or some reader made a note. "Vision of Nahum from El to Kash." Since it was the Jewish practice to name a book after the first words, it was a short step to name a part of a book by the words which began and

[1] Josephus, *Wars*, iv. 8, 1. There is some variance of readings. Most MSS. have *βήταβριν*, one *βήταρις*. Lat. *begabri*. See Niese's ed. vi. 447 n.

[2] Neubauer, *La Géographie du Talmud*, pp. 122–4.

[3] Buhl, *Geog. des A.P.*, p. 192. See Fisher and Guthe's map of Palestine.

[4] Smith's *Dict. Classical Biog.*, art. Epiphanius.

[5] *Das Buch des propheten Nahum*, von O. Happel (1902), p. 6.

ended it. Then somebody else added a *jod* at the end of the word and made it into a gentile or patronymic word. It is not necessary to discuss such a theory in detail. No person competent to judge can believe that anything of the sort really happened. This is just one of those casual guesses of learned men which appear for a moment, are rejected by everyone, and then disappear from sound science.

We therefore conclude that Nahum was a prophet of Judah,[1] with a home about twenty miles from Jerusalem.

W. W. Cannon.

(To be continued.)

ANGLO-SAXON AGRAPHA.

Amongst the uncanonical sayings ascribed to Jesus, one of the most interesting has always seemed that precept which occurs as the text of an ancient English sermon—"Be ye brave in war, and fight with the old serpent, and ye shall receive an everlasting Kingdom." Two slightly variant MSS. of this sermon are in existence, one in the Library of Lambeth Palace and the other in that of Trinity College, Cambridge; they were included by Dr. Richard Morris in his *Old English Homilies*, being numbered 16 and 30 in the two volumes respectively. The words are very definitely attributed to Jesus—"at a time when He dwelt bodily upon earth among mankind and wandered in the land of Jerusalem." The MSS. belong to the twelfth century, but the homilies themselves are thought to date from the eleventh; how much older the sources were upon which they drew it is of course impossible to say.

This is the only one of the usually studied agrapha which is first found in an English work. One instinctively brack-

[1] See Nowack, *Die Kleinen Propheten*, 3rd ed., 1922, p. 241.

etted it in thought with that other remarkable saying found on Akbar's gate at Futteypore-Sikri, in India—"The world is merely a bridge; ye are to pass over it and not to build your dwellings upon it." We almost expect forgotten sayings and fragments of ancient tradition to be unearthed in Egypt or at Mount Sinai; these are so near the centre. But England and India are far out on the circumference and it comes somewhat as a surprise to find that even they have added to our store of possibly authentic hints outside the canon regarding Jesus.

Perhaps greater imagination would keep us from being dull of expectation in such matters. Speaking of the famous monument in China, which tells of the arrival of Nestorian missionaries there in A.D. 635, Rendel Harris says: "I find it hard to believe that all the literature imported by the Nestorians and all the books translated by them can have perished. Somewhere, perhaps in the corners of the Buddhist temples that succeeded to the Christian monasteries, there may be lurking Syriac and Chinese MSS., or Syro-Chinese bilingual MSS., which would add greatly to our knowledge of the Nestorian Church and of the Christian literature. If such exist, they cannot, from the nature of the case, be of late date; and they may be very early. . . . I see no reason why the Diatessaron itself should not turn up in China."[1] This is by the way, but it may serve as a much needed warning and encouragement in these studies; there are countless ways in which quite genuine information may yet come to us regarding the Early Church and her Lord.

Now, though the saying cited above is from an English sermon, it is not actually there in English but in Latin. It is interesting, however, to find that there are several agrapha which are found only in English—or rather in

[1] *Sidelights on New Testament Research*, p. 133.

Anglo-Saxon. I think I am right in saying that they have never before been noticed in any study of this subject, and I will now try to show that they are as deserving of attention as many of the other extra-canonical sayings.

They occur in the "Blickling Homilies," the MS. of which (in the library of Blickling Hall, Norfolk) was transcribed and translated by Dr. Morris for the Early English Text Society in 1874–80. Some consideration of these ancient writings may be of interest, before dealing with the passages involved.

There are nineteen homilies in the MS., some of which however are mere fragments. While several deal with legendary matters, the topics are generally Biblical; there are fairly complete expositions of the stories of the Temptation, the healing of Bartimæus, and of the anointing at Bethany. Interpretations are in the main of the quaintly allegorical sort; for example, "The Evangelist hath said that when the Saviour came nigh to Jericho, light returned to the blind. That means that the deity took our frail nature, and then forthwith the heavenly light which the first man forsook returned to mankind." And again, "The Lord said to his disciples, Ye shall find an ass and her foal bound; bring it to me. What denoteth the ass upon which the Lord Christ would sit but the believing Jewish folk, and also many others who are subjected to God in good will, and therefore are worthy to bear the King of heaven in their hearts, and he will direct them to all good things and will bring them into the 'sight of peace'; for the name of the city which is called Jerusalem signifies 'sight of peace,' because the holy souls rest there." At the same time, there is a good deal of stronger stuff, as, for instance, this regarding forbearance, "By his patience he hath set us an example, that as often as we suffer anything grievous at the hands of evil men, then must we be the more

aroused and instigated to divine love, and be more eager to observe God's behests than to avenge our wrongs." This also has a healthy sound about it, if somewhat exaggerated in expression, "As many poor men as die in the neighbourhood of the rich and wealthy, and because he will not give them the tenth part of his wealth, of all those men's death shall he be guilty and a murderer before the throne of the Eternal Judge, because that he wretchedly and arrogantly previously kept his wealth, and refused it to the Lord's poor." There were stout fellows in the English pulpit a thousand years ago, seemingly!

It is not possible to say with absolute certainty that these homilies are all the work of one man, but the evidence of style appears to point in that direction, or at least to suggest that one homilist was mainly responsible. There is a poetical touch here and there of an unusual kind, as, for example, when Christ is called "the golden blossom." In practically every sermon, again, the hearers are quaintly addressed as "Dearest men"; this phrase does not, I think, occur in Ælfric's "Catholic Sermons," and is eliminated from that one of this (Blickling) collection which he incorporated in a modified form in his work. Unlike that compilation, then, these homilies may very probably be the product of one mind; I shall assume this to be the case throughout the present study though the conclusions would not differ materially if it were not so.

A statement in the MS. appears to show that it was penned in 971, but this does not mean that the sermons were written then, and Dr. Morris judges from their vocabulary and style that they belong to the ninth century—to Alfred's age rather than to Ælfric's. The fact that the MS. was written by two different hands also suggests that it is a copy of an early work. Professor Earle, who does not think the collection homogeneous, considers the older parts

of it date "from some time, and perhaps rather an early time, in the ninth century."[1] Since the oldest extant MS. of the Gospels in Anglo-Saxon is not thought to date before 990, we are clearly dealing with comparatively early material.

Now, when we compare the Gospel quotations in the homilies with the corresponding passages in the Anglo-Saxon Gospels, it becomes at once apparent that we have here quite a different translation. An example selected almost at random will demonstrate this; Matthew iv. 11 is rendered thus:

"Hine þa forlet se costigend, and his englas him to-eodan and him þegnedan."

In the Anglo-Saxon version it reads:

"Ða forlet se deofol hine; and englas genealaehton, and him þenodon."

So, too, we consistently find "disciple" rendered by "þegn" instead of by the interesting compound "leorning-cnicht" (learning-knight)—one of the most delightful features of the Anglo-Saxon text. In this latter point, as in a few others, the homilies agree with the Northumbrian gloss found in the famous Lindisfarne Gospels which is commonly thought to date about 950.

These facts do not necessarily mean that they contain fragments of an earlier written Anglo-Saxon translation, though that is just possible, in which case we may have traces here of the most primitive English version of the Gospels, and of the handiwork of the venerable Bede or the good King Alfred. But it seems more probable that Skeat was right in suggesting that the Anglo-Saxon version, of which only half-a-dozen related MSS. are extant, had a very limited circulation, and that no earlier English version ever existed.[2] If that is so, the Blickling Homilies date

[1] "*Anglo-Saxon Literature*," p. 213.

[2] *The Holy Gospels in Anglo-Saxon*, Preface to St. Luke, p. xi.

from that early period to which the precept in the famous Canons of Ælfric belongs: "The mass-priest shall on Sundays and mass days tell to the people the sense of the Gospel in English . . . Blind is the teacher if he know not book-learning."[1] Each preacher translated as he went along, and our homilist may well be doing the same. The definite way in which, after quoting a considerable passage, he says, "Lo! we have now heard this holy Gospel read before us," rather tends against this view perhaps, but the occasional interjection of a few Latin words followed by their Anglo-Saxon equivalents appears to support it.

Now, under these circumstances we should naturally expect to find a good deal of loose citation and mere paraphrasing, and we certainly do so. For example, Christ's words to Martha are thus rendered:

"Martha, Martha, be thou heedful and mindful of the things of Mary, that is, that thou at all times perform the will of God, which is the one best thing wherewith thou mayest please God. Mary hath chosen the best part, which shall never be taken from her."

There are, moreover, instances of what may best be termed imaginative comment. After a fairly accurate rendering of the story of the Temptation, in the course of his exposition the writer remarks:

"He said, 'Get thee behind me, and bethink thee how great an evil befell thee for thy covetousness and pride, and for thy vain boasting, and therefore I shall not follow thee, for in these three (trials) thou art overcome."

There is no necessity to think of this as other than a legitimate employment of the imagination.

At the same time it seems quite impossible to attribute all the variations from the canonical text to these causes. We might anticipate that a Latin scholar of this period would be in touch with other writings of various worth

[1] Quoted in H. W. Hoare's *Our English Bible*, p. 32.

and as a matter of fact he makes free use of obviously legendary matter, regarding Christ's visit to Hell, for example, and certain adventures of the apostles. He was clearly in touch, too, with some interesting traditions regarding the teaching of St. Paul, especially if Dr. Morris is right in interpreting his phrases " the eminent teacher " and " the excellent teacher " of that apostle. These passages require a separate examination ; I refer to them now merely as evidence that the homilist had before him other documents than the canonical Scriptures.

But further, his citations of Gospel passages frequently point to the same conclusion. Peter is named as the disciple who asked permission to go to bury his father ; we may recall that Clement of Alexandria says it was Philip.[1] Peter and John are named (as in Luke xxii. 8 on a different occasion) as the two who were sent to fetch the ass upon which Jesus sat ; it is interesting that Swete thinks the minuteness of Mark's account is a hint that Peter was one of the two. In the story of Bartimæus, read from Luke xviii., apart from a number of smaller points we may notice these : v. 37 is put into *oratio recta*, " They answered him and said, It is Jesus of Nazareth " ; the man's cry is *twice* given (and again in the comment) thus, " Have mercy upon me, Son of David, have mercy upon me " ; in v. 39 we have the statement, " the more they restrained him, the louder he cried " ; and in the closing sentence both the man and the people are spoken of as giving praise to Jesus not to God. Again, in the story of the anointing at Bethany, the writer starts by quoting John's Gospel and in the main follows it, but he inserts the Martha and Mary incident from Luke and the street comments in Jerusalem from Matthew ; the curiosity of the people regarding Lazarus leads to a quotation of Isaiah xxix. 13 (" This people honour

[1] *Miscellanies*, III. 4.

me with their words, and yet their heart is far from me"), which appears in quite a different context in Matthew and Mark; the Hosanna shouting is twice quoted with the name Jesus included; and there is the odd statement about Judas that "the apostles allowed him to carry their wallets, because they wished thereby to try his covetousness."

This all looks very much as if a slightly different text was being used or some other document as well as the four Gospels. Are these traces of an interpolated text like that of Codex Bezæ? Or of an elaborated narrative like the Gospel of Peter? Or of some unknown harmony, for there is no apparent connexion with the Diatessaron?

We may remark here that it is quite evident the Latin MSS. used in Britain at this period were of a predominantly "Western" type. The large interpolation in Matthew xx. 28 in the Anglo-Saxon version is a witness to that fact, and there are many other points. In a few cases this version stands alone, but these are unimportant and may be due merely to the first English translator's idiosyncrasies. His sources were probably not strictly Old Latin MSS. (as Bosworth suggests[1]) but copies of the Vulgate into which many of the older readings had crept. We know, too, that King Alfred used such a text, for he includes the negative "Golden Rule" in Acts xv. 29, when citing that passage in his code.[2] And the Codex Aureus which was in this country at that time is also of this kind. It is therefore not a fantastic hypothesis that other variations existed in some MS. used by our homilist, and that some of the phenomena we are considering may be due to this cause.

Our task then in examining the possible agrapha in these homilies is to hold the balance as justly as we can between paraphrase and kindred influences on the one hand and real

[1] *The Gothic and Anglo-Saxon Gospels*, p. xi.
[2] Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible*, v. p. 236.

extra-canonical tradition on the other. The question of genuineness, of course, comes presently; the point now is —was the homilist in touch with actual traditions whether or not these are to be judged authentic? I think he was in at least these five cases:

1. Let us be mindful of what Christ himself has commanded us in the Gospel. He has said that we should, every twelvemonth, give (to God) the tithe of our increase.
2. It is written in Christ's books that the Lord himself said that the tenth part of our goods were under our own control, both as regards land and other possessions and other acquisitions.
3. Christ himself has said that he will not hear the negligent and forgetful man's prayers.
4. We know that Christ himself said by his own mouth: "When ye see growing and blowing all the fruits of the earth, and the fragrant odours exhaling from plants, then soon afterwards they shall dry up and dwindle away on account of the summer's heat."
5. Christ himself said, "Ye have me ever present among believing men, through the glory of my divine nature."

Notice the definiteness of these statements—the phrase "Christ (or the Lord) himself" occurs in them all; yet they bring to mind no obvious canonical passages. No. 5 is used to suggest that John xii. 8 (b) was not to be read literally as though it denied the abiding presence of Christ; many canonical passages might have been chosen for this purpose.

In the following eight instances it is much more doubtful whether we should not regard the writer merely as loosely citing canonical texts:

6. "Learn of me, for I am merciful and lowly."
7. "I am the way of truth."
8. Concerning those (evil) Judges, Christ himself hath spoken; he said, "Judge now, as ye will that ye should be judged hereafter at the last day of this world."
9. "I am the life of this world, he who follows me shall not go into darkness but he shall have the light of everlasting life."

10. "I will not leave you without a leader, but I will send you the Paraclete."
11. "Ye need not be sad nor troubled in your hearts, for I will intercede for you with the Father that he may preserve you through his heavenly power."
12. "Blessed are the spirits of the poor, for they shall rest in heaven's kingdom; and blessed are those who care not for this world's riches; and blessed are those that weep now for their sins, for they shall be hereafter comforted in heaven's kingdom."
13. "If ye obey me and follow me, not one hair of your head shall perish."

Most of these recall familiar texts to which it is unnecessary we should refer in full, but a few points may be noted. No. 8 does not contradict Matthew vii. 1 as John vii. 24 shows. As regards No. 9, Dr. Morris has perhaps misled by translating "go into" instead of "walk in," for the words are the same as in John viii. 12, but the change of "light" in that verse into "life" is odd. The context of No. 12 is rather muddled, but there is a reference to the opening passage of the Sermon on the Mount; apart from that fact the second of these beatitudes at least would be apparently an agraphon. Comparing the direct challenge of No. 13 with Luke xxi. 18, one cannot feel sure that a variant tradition is not here being tapped.

Coming now to the question of authenticity, I submit that the possibility of genuine elements being included is not just to be lightly ruled out. Earle speaks of the homilies dating from the time when "the line was very dimly drawn between canonical and uncanonical, and when quotations, legends, and arguments were admissible which now surprise us in a sermon," and he practically equates *uncanonical* and *unauthentic*. But we ought to realise that a book might properly be excluded from the canon as in the main fictitious and yet contain true and otherwise unknown details. A floating tradition did undoubtedly exist in

early centuries some points of which were well founded.

It is quite conceivable that a host of influences may have united to hinder genuine utterances of Jesus coming down to us at all or to close all channels of transmission save one. Remember the "many things" of Mark vi. 34 and the "many other things" of John xxi. 25, and notice especially the case of the "sabbath-worker" anecdote in Codex Bezæ. If the vessel in which this famous MS. came to England had sunk with all hands, how much we should have missed! But similar mishaps may easily have destroyed equally or more valuable documents used by our homilist or one of his predecessors. It is not incredible that the "Gospel according to the Hebrews" was then in this country, for example, or some old copy of Papias' "Expositions." Why not?

More particularly it does not seem improbable that Jesus made some reference during His ministry to the "tithe" teaching of the Old Testament, and if He did so it would surely be along the line of Nos. 1 and 2, that to give thus is right but that the yielding of them should be a voluntary, not a compulsory action. One cannot help feeling that the modern Church needs this teaching; Dr. J. H. Jowett wrote once, "I have noticed that some people assume they are very generous, but it is simply because they have no system in their giving, and no record of their gifts."

Regarding Nos. 3, 10, 11, it is not at all unlikely that Jesus so spoke if the Johannine teaching includes (as I believe it does) much genuine material; No. 3 is like a negative counterpart of John xiv. 14, while the references in the Epistles to Christ as intercessor may well have had some such source as No. 11. No. 4 looks like a Christian form of the argument of Isaiah xl. 6–8. No. 5 has to me a little the tone of an actual saying marred in the course of transmission. In No. 8 the definite reference to magistrates

and the infusion of the "Golden Rule" idea are both new and may well be from Jesus Himself; it would not have surprised us to find such a variation of His teaching within the canon—a remark which is equally true of No. 13.

It is interesting to notice that in the much more numerous but to my mind less interesting "Catholic Sermons" of Ælfric, there are no sayings that one can with any confidence regard as uncanonical sayings of Jesus. At first sight the following appears to be quoted as though it were part of John xx. 21, but it probably has no other basis.

"The Father loveth the Son, but yet he sendeth him to suffer for the redemption of men."

The nearest approach to a real agraphon is this;

"He who obeyeth you, obeyeth me; and he who contemneth you, contemneth me."

It is more like Luke x. 16 than anything else, but the resemblance is not very close, and that verse is correctly cited in another of these sermons. It is clear then that Ælfric's work has much less to contribute to this subject than those we have been studying.

In conclusion, having dealt mainly with matters regarding which there must in the nature of things be considerable doubt, let us add a fine sentence from the close of one of the Blickling Homilies about which there will be neither doubt nor controversy: "Now then, Dearest men, let us believe in our Lord, and love him and keep his behests; then shall be fulfilled in us what he himself hath declared—'Blessed be the pure in heart, for they shall see God.' In that sight shall be all believers, and of his bliss shall there be no end, but ever may they rejoice with him where he liveth and reigneth, ever without end everlastingly. Amen."

Roderic Dunkerley.

GNOSTICISM AND LIFE.

II.

(3) To the casual observer Gnosticism, wherever it is found, presents what seems to be a baffling problem in morals. Those who come in contact with Hinduism are struck with the fact that gross *licentiousness* and a severe ascetic form of *holiness* alternate with one another in the same system; and what seems more strange still, licentiousness of the worst type is often equated with holiness. But this follows naturally from the principle of Dualism. If matter in itself is evil, and if the spirit is imprisoned in the material body, which in itself is evil; then, as the body is the instrument of conduct or activity within the material realm, two courses may be followed. It is possible to argue that the body being evil, the freedom of the spirit can only be obtained by chastising it, and practising the most rigid ascetism. Such asceticism may differ in degree in different men, but in every case its object is individualistic and selfish —to secure the salvation of the individual soul. In its extreme form it reaches absolute *passivity*—a refusal to act at all. In such an extreme form it is met with in Buddhism; for the god-principle[1] of Buddhism is passive—a dead sea of spirit into which all spirits sink after a period or periods of activity: and activity is in itself evil. Buddhism is, strictly speaking, a nihilistic form of Gnosticism. Its hope is not immortality but extinction, or at least cessation from activity. But it is the extreme logical outcome of the individualistic asceticism which Gnosticism produced. In some of its forms this asceticism resulted in men rejecting certain foods, lacerating themselves, practising celibacy, withdrawing from human society, refraining

[1] Strictly speaking, of course, Buddhism is not theistic.

from washing, or the more spectacular form of standing on a pedestal until death from exhaustion occurred. That this ascetic form of Gnosticism had begun to influence the Ephesian Churches is clear from the First Epistle to Timothy. Paul speaks of men who were "forbidding to marry and commanding to abstain from meats which *God created* to be received with thanksgiving by them that believe and have *gnosis* of the truth"; [1] and then he follows this up with the Christian doctrine of creation: "For every creature of God is *good*, and nothing is to be rejected, if it be received with thanksgiving: for it is sanctified through the word of God and prayer." [2] It is clear also that Timothy himself had yielded to ascetic practices, and was suffering in consequence. How *real* and true to life the writings of the New Testament are, is shown by the insertion, near the end of the fifth chapter, of an injunction which concerns Timothy's health: "Be no longer a drinker of water, but use a little wine for thy stomach's sake and thine oft infirmities." [3] Many forms of Christianity which have not advocated such rigid forms of asceticism have, however, taken over the principle in being satisfied with *negative goodness*, and in teaching that God could be pleased in seeing His creatures refuse His good gifts—denying the world which He created for our enjoyment and well being. Virtue has been equated with abstinence from marriage, from bodily exercise, from games, and a whole host of legitimate pleasures which this world gives to us; whereas virtue is really *doing good*. God whom Jesus revealed does not take pleasure in seeing men miserable, neither is salvation gained by the negative path of asceticism, whether individualistic or monastic, catholic or puritan. Self-denial, on the other hand, is a supreme Christian virtue; but it is self-denial *for the sake of others*, and therefore can only be practised in

[1] 1 Tim. iv. 3. [2] 1 Tim. iv. 4. [3] 1 Tim. v. 23.

the *social* sphere by being *active* in every good work. The kind of asceticism we have described—an asceticism based on Dualism—leads naturally to the cult of perfect holiness. This was the mark of certain Gnostics in John's day. They were superior in their attitude to other Christians—they had the *gnosis*, and were free from sin! John treats their claim in a very summary manner: "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves. . . . If we say we have not sinned, we make Him a liar." [1] Holiness is not to be reached along the negative road of *giving up*, but along the road of *doing*. There is nothing more certain than the fact that the teaching of Jesus stresses activity: to be passive in this world, except to suffer wrong at the hands of others, is to be the opposite of what He was.

But in the second place it is possible to argue that if the body is evil and the spirit good, the evil of the body cannot affect the soul, and so the body may be given over to all manner of licentiousness without the spirit being injured. The principle of Dualism is bound to work itself out in this way sooner or later. So it did in the Churches of Proconsular Asia in John's day. His first epistle is full of warnings against this form of Gnosticism. "He that saith, I have gnosis of Him and keepeth not His commandments, is a liar . . . he that saith he abideth in Him ought himself also to walk even as He walked." [2] The Gnostics had evidently gone to extremes—given themselves up to the lust of the world. Hence John's severe warning against loving the world in this sense—a warning which Christians have too often interpreted as meaning that we must be otherworldly and renounce this world, the chief duty of Christians being to engage in "spiritual exercises"! Prayer-meetings, hymn-singing, Holy Communion, have been regarded as *ends* in themselves instead of as *means* to an end; and

[1] 1 John i. 8–10. [2] 1 John ii. 4–6.

Christianity has too often become mere sanctimonious piety. The first epistle of John knows nothing of such sanctimonious piety—nor does any other part of the New Testament—except to condemn it. John does not speak of "*being* righteous," but of "*doing* righteousness"—a very different thing. In fact he distinctly says that "he that *doeth* righteousness is righteous," [1] and the converse, "Whosoever *doeth* not righteousness is not of God." [2] With John there can be no such thing as love apart from activity: "My little children, let us not love in word, neither with the tongue, but in deed and truth." [3] Moreover there is no pessimism about this world, for he says: "For whatsoever is begotten of God overcometh the world; and this is the victory that hath overcome the world, even our *faith* (not *gnosis*)." [4] The duty of the Christian Church is to be in this world as He was—to go about doing good, rendering service to humanity; and no amount of engaging in "spiritual exercises" will make up for our lack in this direction. We may have the tongues of angels, the gift of prophecy, and faith to remove mountains; but these things count for nothing unless we have real active love, which never backbites, never stands on its dignity, never takes offence, is never anxious for prestige, never rejoices in evil slander, using as its chief delight the familiar unctuous "there I told you so"; but which constrains us to visit the fatherless and the sick, and to become the friends of outcasts and even harlots—for such was He. We cannot possibly be Christians whilst most of our activity is prompted by self-interest, whether in the direction of saving our souls or our skins.

This Dualism works in a special way in modern Christianity. It leads men to relegate certain things to the sphere of religion, and other things to the sphere of the

[1] 1 John iii. 7. [2] 1 John iii. 10. [3] 1 John iii. 18.
[4] 1 John v. 4.

world. And so men speak of "the religious life," and this religious life is often bound up with one day in the week—with Church-going, hymn-singing, and pious conversations on Sunday. With others it extends to all the days in the week, but it is of the same type. It means avoiding the grosser sins such as drunkenness, fornication, lying, and stealing (in their more obvious forms), murder, and such like: forgetting that Paul classed *covetousness* as equal with fornication.[1] It means also attention to acts of piety—really as a means of merit-making—but it has no reference, or very little, except so far as the grosser sins mentioned above are concerned, to the real stuff of life: to business transactions, to responsibility to our neighbours, to doing good (not being good) every moment of our lives.

In one sense there is no such thing as "the religious life": all life is religious, and religion *is* life. "I came that you might have life, and have it more abundantly." People talk about being "spiritually minded," and they mean being sanctimonious, sentimental, unreal. To be spiritually minded is to be robust in spirit, not sickly and anæmic; to drink of the cup which He drank, and to be baptized with His baptism, to take upon us as much as we can in His strength, the sorrows and sufferings of the world, and never to rest until injustice, covetousness, crime and misery are put out of existence. Sin is not in the body—in matter itself—but in the perverse will of man, who seeks to use the world for his own gain. There is no Dualism between matter and spirit in a gnostic sense. Such a Dualism is the opium of Christianity.

(4) Gnosticism was entirely individualistic. It taught a doctrine of individual salvation, and its weakness on the ethical side was in some measure due to this characteristic.

[1] See Eph. v. 3; Col. iii. 5. See also the *Didache*, chaps. i., ii., and iv. The same idea is also embodied in the Decalogue.

Social concepts were absent: the thing which mattered was that the individual soul should be in right relationship to God. Now this individualistic note was characteristic of Greek thought, so Gnosticism found a congenial home on Greek soil. But the Hebrew religion was intensely social —it was the religion of a nation, and to be in right relationship to Yahweh, the individual must be in right relationship to the nation. Christianity seems to have combined these two features of religion—the individualistic and the social. It taught the value of the individual soul, but it was by no means anti-social. On the contrary it centred in a Divine Society—the Church—and the Christian life was only realised in this Society. In early Christianity the Church was supreme, and its purpose was to bring about the wider unity of mankind—the Kingdom of God. It was as difficult for the early Christian to conceive of a man being in right relationship to God apart from the *fellowship of the brotherhood*—the Church—as for a Jew to conceive of an alien having any dealings with Yahweh. But the Gnostic troublers of the Church boasted that it did not matter how they treated their brethren so long as they had the *gnosis*. Having the *gnosis* made their individual relationship with God right and nothing else mattered. It is an attitude which is found in our own day. Certainly Protestant Christianity has too often stressed the importance of the individual at the expense of the corporate society, but there are hopeful signs that it is now prepared to adjust the balance.[1] Throughout the First Epistle of John we see stress laid on the corporate society as against this individualism of Gnosticism. "If we walk in the light we have *fellowship with one another*." [2] The Gnostics claimed

[1] The work of the late Prof. Troeltsch in Germany is significant. See *The Sufficiency of Christianity*, by R. S. Sleigh. C.O.P.E.C. is also very significant. See Report I.

[2] 1 John. i. 7, *et seq.*

that they were in the light without troubling about this fellowship, and this is no uncommon attitude to-day. John goes on actually to make the benefits of the Cross depend on this fellowship. This may seem rather startling, but we cannot escape the fact that it was John's view. Again he says: "He that saith he is in the light, and hateth his brother, is in the darkness even until now." [1] "He that hateth his brother is in the darkness, and walketh in the darkness, and hath not *gnosis* of where he goes." [2] The Gnostics claimed, in a superior way, to have real gnosis of where they were going: their initiation had given them a real insight into the future; but John says plainly that they were in the darkness so long as they pursued the policy of neglecting their brethren, and refused them that love which is the chief condition of fellowship with God. "He that loveth not abideth in death." [3] We must remember above all things that this love is not a matter of the emotions or intellect, but of the will; for he says, "Whoso hath this world's goods, and beholdeth his brother in need, and shutteth up his compassion from him, how doth the love of God abide in him? . . . let us not love in word, neither with the tongue; but in deed and in truth." [4] We may boast of our intellectual or mystical apprehension of the truth or of any other form of *gnosis*, we may boast of our spirituality as we like, or of our capacity for attending services or engaging in "spiritual exercises"; we may satisfy ourselves that our individual experience of conversion was everything it should have been; we may even be as orthodox as we like; but if John is any guide we shall have to accept the fact that these things are valueless if we neglect the *duties* of love.[5] It is easy enough to accept

[1] 1 John ii. 9. [2] 1 John ii. 11. [3] 1 John iii. 14.
[4] 1 John iii. 17–18.
[5] I must not be understood as meaning that they are valueless in themselves when used as means to an end. They are valueless from John's

certain dogmas and practise a certain cultus, but what does it matter if the world of suffering does not stir us to active love; if it stirs within us only an emotion? We are then no better than the Gnostics. To John, belief in Jesus as Christ, and active love, were at least of equal importance; for he equated them as the commandment of the religion which he was set to defend.

(5) Gnosticism was arrogant and claimed to have solved all the baffling perplexities of life. Those who were initiated received the "key" of existence. This "key" might consist of a string of magic names. Such gnostic arrogance —in the case of Christianity—no doubt first took the form of claiming that the spiritual gift of knowledge initiated the one who received it into all the mysteries of life. The First Corinthian Epistle throws a good deal of light on this. There were some in the Church at Corinth who boasted of such *gnosis* and refused to accept the words of Paul. They too were undoubtedly individualistic—hence Paul's great classic on active love. He is scathing when he speaks of their arrogant claims to perfect knowledge and tells them plainly that "now we know in part." [1] There was a fundamental agnosticism in Christianity, and Paul, who had been caught up into heaven and seen things unspeakable, told these boasting Gnostics that he himself was only able to "see things in a riddle," [2] and that it had not entered into the intellect of man to conceive the things that God had prepared.[3] There is no argument against learning in the Corinthian epistles, as some have vainly supposed, but a denunciation of the very opposite thing—spiritual *gnosis*, which always tends to make people puffed up and arrogant. Writing to the Ephesians, Paul prays that they

point of view when they are made ends in themselves or used as means to a wrong end.

[1] 1 Cor. xiii. 12. [2] Ibid. [3] 1 Cor. ii. 9.

"may apprehend the breadth and length and height and depth and have *gnosis* of the love of Christ," and that they "may be filled unto *all the fulness* of God." [1] This looks as if he is enunciating the possibility of a full or perfect *gnosis*, but he is careful to add that this love which they are to know "passeth knowledge." John delivers the same message. The Gnostics boasted of their superior position into which they had been introduced by their initiation, but he reminds the orthodox Christians that they—the faithful—had received an anointing from the Holy One, and thus they had *gnosis* of all things. But that he does not mean this in a gnostic sense is clear; for later he says—again refuting the gnostic troublers—"it is not yet made manifest what we shall be. We have *gnosis* that if He shall be manifested, we shall be like Him; for we shall see Him even as He is." [2] Christianity was the religion of the Incarnation. It did not offer to solve the riddles of the universe, but it was founded upon Him who was love personified, and suffering, sorrow and difficulty alike vanished where it came, because it taught men how to rise superior to them. It was sufficient for Christians to have *gnosis* that they would be like Him. They needed nothing better. Christianity was the way of *faith*, not of complete *gnosis*.[3]

(6) Gnosticism was also eclectic in its character. It chose the best from all faiths—and sometimes it chose the worst—and so it was an easy system for the missionary to propagate. True, it was more at home with pantheism than where the transcendence of God was emphasised: but it was not averse to a change of form wherever it went. The religions of the East—Hinduism and Buddhism—have the same characteristic, and Theosophy boasts of its eclec-

[1] Eph. iii. 14–19. [2] 1 John iii. 2.

[3] See an article I contributed to the *Modern Churchman*, January 1923, on *Gnostic or Agnostic?*

ticism. But whilst Christianity left room for development it had its roots in history. Certain things had happened in time and space. It was the religion of the Incarnation. In fact it was a religion, and not a pseudo-philosophy. It could not be eclectic in the sense that Gnosticism was; and above all, the main thing was to "walk even as He had walked."

(7) Gnosticism largely failed to capture Christianity because it was esoteric. It was a secret system into which one had to be initiated. In some of its forms it could make no appeal to large masses of the people, who did not possess the intellectual acumen necessary to appreciate its teaching. Buddhism was driven out of India for the same reason, and to-day who would attempt to convert the African negro with the teachings of Theosophy! What would be the good of giving a Theosophical lecture to large masses in our city slums! Even Christian Science, although all its philosophy (?) can be learnt in half an hour by a trained mind, has its inner circle of teaching and teachers. There is no preaching in its services, and its trained lecturers, who have to be certified by the Mother Church, are not allowed to reveal this inner teaching. Christianity is in the first place *ethical* and then intellectual, and thus makes its appeal to all. It is first of all a *way*, i.e. a manner of life. This does not mean that it is simple, as is often claimed; on the contrary, it is most profound; for it is also the Truth. But knowledge in the Christian system comes through activity in the first place. If we wish to know the doctrine we must do it, and if we do it we shall know. At first Christianity should strike us as *difficult*, as appealing to the heroic, and only on second thoughts as being profound.

(8) Lastly the sacraments of the religions which were most profoundly influenced by Gnosticism, were magical and were treated as ends in themselves. Too often Christian

sacraments have been so regarded, but the Christian sacraments were ethical in their outworking. To Paul it was unthinkable that those who had received the grace of Baptism—had passed through the experience of dying and rising with Christ—should live in sin. And the purpose of Holy Communion was the receiving of His Body and Blood, that as He was so they might be in this world. The ethical character of the Christian sacraments is further stressed by the fact that they were *social* rites. The sacraments were not devices for dodging people into heaven: they were not ends in themselves: they were means to an end, and that end was that Christians should live lives of active goodness in the world—such as Jesus had lived. To early Christians the sacraments were the supreme channels of grace, but they were never part of a merit-making machine, such as they have too often become in the apprehension of Christians.[1]

In view of all this we need to ask ourselves: How far—in our own case—is the relationship between religion and life, which dominates our Christian practice, founded upon gnostic principles rather than upon those which are distinctly Christian?

W. Robinson.

NOTES AND NOTICES OF RECENT CRITICISM.

"A TALE THAT IS TOLD."

In the January issue of the Expositor the reviewer of Dr. R. H. Fisher's Baird Lecture, criticising his reference to the above well-known phrase in Psalm xc. 9, remarks, "'Tale' here is not a story but the reckoning of sheep passing hurriedly one after another into the fold." But is this correct? Had the early

[1] See further an article which I contributed to the *Interpreter*, Apri 1924, on *Baptism and Psychology*.

translators of the Authorised Version, and possibly other versions, the shepherd's "tale" in mind when they rendered the passage thus? No support for such a suggestion is to be found in the original Hebrew or in the LXX, which has ἀράχνην, "a spider's web." The Hebrew is *hegeh*, correctly rendered in the Revised Version (marg.) and in Moffatt's *Old Testament* "as a sigh": it is only found elsewhere in Job xxxvii. 2, where it refers to the "rumblings" of thunder, and in Ezekiel ii. 10, where it is translated "mourning" in the Revised Version and "dirges" in Moffatt's *Old Testament*. Evidently it had nothing to do with counting. The verb *hagah* signifies "to growl" (as a lion growling over its prey); "to groan, to moan in distress" (as a dove); in several passages "to utter"; "to soliloquise, meditate, muse" (as of one muttering to himself, repeating something aloud to himself and so memorising it), cp. Joshua i. 8, Psalm i. 2, etc. And from this verb we have *higgaion*,[1] "sounding music" (Ps. ix. and xcii.), "meditation" (Ps. xix. 15, "the meditation of my heart"), and "plottings" (Lamentations iii. 62) (R.V. has "their imagination against me"): the word is found in these passages only.

It will be noticed that there is no indication here that either *hagah* or any derivative of it signified "to number" or "a counting"; but there is support for the surmise that a rare word which occurs in only two other passages might signify a "tale" in the ordinary sense of the term, or a "dirge" as it is rendered in one of the passages quoted above: for a "soliloquy" or a "meditation" is next of kin to a tale or story. The late Dr. James Hastings has this remark in the article on "Tale" in *H.D.B.*: "In all the examples but one of 'tale' in the Authorised Version (apart from the Apocr.) it means 'number' or 'sum.'" He makes no reference to the passage in Psalm xc. 9, and he does not cite it among the texts quoted in the article. Is it the one exception? or is there another? Certainly "tale-bearer" is common enough, especially in Proverbs. Of course "as a sigh" is probably the correct rendering of the Hebrew of the Massoretic Text: my argument is that the many preachers (among them Henry Drummond—see *The Ideal Life*, page 249 f.) who have used these words in the way in which Dr. R. H. Fisher uses them have not misunderstood the English rendering

[1] Also *haguth*, "a meditation, musing," only in Ps. xlix. 4.

that the Hebrew scholars of 300 years ago, when they wrote "a tale that is told," meant "tale" in the sense of a story or narrative: indeed something may be said in support of their translation even from the standpoint of the original Hebrew. I should certainly be interested to know what reasons can be given in support of the contention of those, like your reviewer, who maintain that "tale" in this passage signifies a number or sum.

ARTHUR T. BURBRIDGE.

[(*a*) I have always assumed that "we spend our years as a tale that is told" meant the brevity of life, referring to the years that pass so quickly, all the more quickly as life goes on. "Tale" is always a number in the Authorised Version, not a story, and "telling a tale" was in English the phrase for shepherds counting the tale or number of their flocks; as the sheep pass into the pen, going more rapidly as the flock begins to end, the shepherd tells or reckons their number. If the Authorised Version translators thought of a story, it was not a very appropriate idea, for Oriental stories are not brief. (*b*) The rendering "tale" in either sense is wrong; *hegeh* cannot fairly yield even the sense of story or meditation, unless we assume an unexampled use of it. The Authorised Version seems to have erred by sharpening the version, "quasi sermonem," which Jerome had.]

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

(*a*) "IF it is not an intrusion, may I invite you to comment upon this opinion by Dr. T. R. Glover in the columns of the *Daily News* upon your translation of the Blessing of Jacob in Genesis xlix. 5. Dr. Glover is at present President of our Baptist Union, and what he writes naturally carries weight with us. He says that 'the English lapses. *Simeon and Levi are a* pair —that is slang! *Their plots are ruthless stabs!*—that is hardly English at all, if I am a judge.' Personally I follow your version and enjoy it here as elsewhere; but I would like to learn from you the reasons why our President objects to your rendering" (W. T. R., London).

The term "slang" is used hastily and indiscriminately by some critics. It is a synonym for vulgar colloquialisms, which every serious translator will shun. But academic persons are

apt to forget that the so-called "correct" English is always being enriched as well as corrupted by infusions from the spoken language of the period. Also it is true that this dividing line between "correct" and "colloquial" language has been wavering from the very first, in ancient as well as in modern days. It requires an extremely careful knowledge of the language to be sure that any given expression has not justified itself as part of the real language, though it may be an expression drawn from ordinary talk. Thus, in the first instance quoted, the expression is not slang at all, if I am a judge. The Hebrew term rendered "brethren" in the Authorised Version is not so tautological as that. Simeon and Levi were brothers; there was no need to stress the fact. What the poem wishes to say is that they were well matched, alike in spirit, akin in temper, and the implication is that their common disposition was malevolent. They were, in fact, "par ignobile fratrum." Now for this community of character we possess an exact English equivalent in "a pair," a depreciatory epithet which suits the Hebrew expression like a glove, since the passage is one of popular poetry.

As for the second phrase, this line of the couplet is not truly rendered "instruments of cruelty are in their habitations" (Authorised Version), nor even does the Revised Version meet the case by its "weapons of violence are their swords." These phrases may be English, but they miss what the poet meant. Although the Hebrew is obscure, it seems to be best pointed *mikrotham*, i.e. their plots or compacts. These are called "stabs," because such plots struck at the lives of their enemies, and, with all respect to Dr. Glover, this is intelligible English, as legitimate as Swift's

"Each line stabs,"

or as Shakespeare's

"She speaks poniards, and every word stabs."

Why should not a Hebrew poet be allowed to say as much? He must be a prosaic person who does not understand what is meant by a plot "stabbing" at society. I am sure that Dr. Glover understands it; in the case of a lesser man we would need to pardon his remark as the slip of a clever critic who was so keen for the moment on scoring points that he forgot the range of his own language.

(*b*) "In my Sunday-school class to-day I read your version of the death or departure of Elijah, to the plain interest of the boys. I was specially glad to read your rendering of verse nine of the chapter. It cleared up a difficulty which I have always felt about Elisha. But if what Elisha really asked was, 'Let me fall heir to your spirit,' how did the English Version ever come to render the words by 'Let a double portion of thy spirit be upon me'? Can you tell me if there is a different Hebrew reading underneath these two versions" (T. W., Hull).

No, the Hebrew text is the same. The mistake in the Authorised Version is due to the fact that it is translated literally. The words mean literally the portion which fell to an eldest son. But it is quite inappropriate to suggest that Elisha desired to be twice as important as Elijah or even that he wanted more of the spirit of his master than anyone else. All he desired was to inherit the authority and power of his master. To be literal here is to be misleading.

(*c*) "In reading Dr. Peake's one-volume Commentary on the Bible, I observe that the Rev. W. E. Addis, on p. 379, says that Psalm xli. 1 is wrongly translated in our version, and that we get a better connexion of thought if we read, 'Blessed is he who acts circumspectly, though poor.' Is there any justification for this opinion?" (J. J. T., New York).

The forty-first Psalm opens with a beatitude:

> "Happy is he who remembers the weak and the poor!
> Yahweh will deliver him on the day of trouble, etc."

The original text, as we infer from the LXX, read "the weak and the poor," not simply the weak. "Remembers" is the Hiphil of שׂכל in the sense of "attend to"; the good man does not forget in his prosperity to pay heed to the needy, and therefore God remembers to help him in his own hour of need. This gives the clue to the petitions which follow, for "the weak and the poor" include, if they do not specially imply, people who are in sickness. At any rate the prominence of this virtue in ancient ethics is sufficient to explain the motive. Mr. C. M. Doughty, for example, in *Arabia Deserta* tells how a hospitable Arab called Maatuk treated him; "if the camels came home he milked a great bowlful for the stranger, saying it was his *sadaka* or meritorious human kindness, for God's sake." There

is no need, therefore, to amend the text till we lose this beatitude. The opinion you quote was held by the late Dr. Briggs, who proposed to take *maskil* here by itself, with *el* as a mistaken gloss ; the following words then became a phrase in opposition to the nominative, and we are told to translate the line, " happy be he who acts circumspectly, though weak and needy." But *maskil el* is used thus, though in a slightly different sense, in Nehemiah viii. 13, just as we would in English say " attend to " of a man listening to advice or of a man looking after the pains and needs of another. Those who, like Mr. Addis, take Dr. Briggs' view argue that the connexion is clearer. But is it ? On this reading the psalmist appeals to God for help against his malicious neighbours on the ground that he has always taken care of his own behaviour. It is surely more apt, in view of Oriental ethics, to assume that he brought forward a specific plea like that of humanity, instead of a general, vague plea. " I am sick," he cries ; " let my *sadaka* be remembered, that I have always been kind to sickness and every form of human need."

REVIEWS.

The Christian Gospel of the Fatherhood of God. By John Mackintosh Shaw, M.A., D.D. Hodder & Stoughton. Price 6*s*.

This is a book which a reviewer can warmly commend. It has a modern outlook upon several vital questions as to the interpretation of the Christian faith. Competent scholarship is apparent in its less than two hundred pages, but is never obtruded. Dr. Shaw has command of a delightfully lucid style, and what he writes is suffused with the warmth of personal conviction. The aim of his book is " to rethink and rediscover the essential basal Christian convictions back of the traditional intellectual or theological formulations, with a view to their subsequent restatement or reinterpretation in terms which are vital and meaningful for the living thought of to-day." In pursuit of this aim he takes the Fatherhood of God as the regulative idea in all the six lectures. He rightly points out that what is new in the Christian idea of the Fatherhood of God is not the mere use of the word " Father " in speaking of God,

but the *experience* of the filial fellowship of Jesus with His Father in heaven. In the fatherly love of God, revealed not only in the teaching of Jesus, but above all in His life and practice, Dr. Shaw finds the *absolute* attribute of God, in distinction from such *relative* attributes as omnipotence and justice. In the latter half of the first lecture there are some excellent pages on the Fatherhood of God in creation, in providence and in redemption. In the light of the Fatherhood of God the subsequent lectures deal with prayer, the incarnation, the death of Jesus and His resurrection. On two points I venture to make a remark. On page 93 Dr. Shaw says : "The experimental acquaintance with Jesus' power to save is, after all, the only really final and incontrovertible proof of His unique Divinity or Deity ; so that in the last resort, as Herrmann of Marburg used to say, 'we cannot prove the Divinity of Jesus to the unbelieving.'" How does this tally with the long argument in the preceding pages which is evidently meant to demonstrate the Divinity of Jesus apart from acquaintance this experience ? Again, Dr. Shaw expresses little sympathy with forensic theories of the atonement. But some form of a forensic theory seems at one point to have slipt into his thinking. On p. 133 he speaks of " the atoning quality " of the death of Jesus. The only clue I have discovered to what he means by that phrase is on pp. 124–129, where he speaks of Jesus in Gethsemane and on the Cross, " accepting to the full the consequences of man's sin, even to the sense of separation from God's fellowship, which is sin's last judgment and most terrible sequel."

D. M. Ross.

* * * * *

Inscriptiones Latinae Christianae Veteres. Edidit Ernestus Diehl. Fasc. 2, 3, 4 (pp. 81–320). Berlin : Weidmann, 1924. Price M.3.75 per fascicule.

The first fascicule of this important publication was noticed in the EXPOSITOR for December, 1924 (p. 491 sq.) ; by that date the next three parts had appeared, and one cannot but congratulate editor and publisher on the speed with which publication is being maintained—no small feat when it is remembered that the setting up of inscriptions is delicate and exacting work.

These three new fascicules contain the inscriptions numbering from 361 to 1648 ; they cover a large field, from municipal titles,

through all the ranks of the clergy, in Rome, Africa, Spain, Gaul and Britain, to mentions of *Baptisma*, *Pascha*, *Fides*, *Trinitas*, *Deus*, *Dei Filius* and *Dei Genetrix*.

The importance of such a compact and ordered presentation of material for the study of these various points in the history of the early Church need not be emphasised. In the fascicules now before us, there is already a corpus of information for the student of history, language, or, most of all, the faith of the people. No. 1549 is an interesting example: Julia[1] Florentina was "pagana nata," but after 18 months and 22 days was "fidelis facta." Being at the point of death, she was baptised at the eighth hour of night, and died four hours later. When her parents were bewailing her loss, there came to them by night a "vox maiestatis," forbidding lamentation. Her body was buried ten days afterwards "pro foribus martyrum." All these details are of considerable interest; the burial near the tomb of martyrs becomes one of the most prized honours of later times.

In 1515 A, *Deo uiuit* is used in an unusual, but quite justifiable sense: "to die," i.e. to awake on the other side of time; it should be compared with the normal expression for a martyr's death-day, "natalis," the day on which he was born to everlasting life. *Deuota mente* (1587) and *fidelissima mente* (1593) are interesting forms; *acceptio* (1535) and *consecutio* (1528) are used of receiving a sacrament.

The days of the week, too, are, throughout, still called by their pagan names (*dies veneris*, etc.) in spite of all attempts to encourage *feria prima*, *secunda*, etc.

As in the first part, the notes here are to the point, and though not full, are yet sufficient. The only detail on which one might differ from the learned editor is the placing of number 1579, the famous inscription to Placentinus, Bishop of Madaura and contemporary of Augustine: this ought surely to have a place among the *Episcopi Africi* in fasc. 3 instead of being relegated

[1] Why does the editor read this name as *Julia*, without a note to show that it has been read as *Nila*, a form which seems to us justified by the authority Diehl quotes, Kaufmann? It is worth noting that this inscription, preserved in the Louvre, is pre-Constantinian, and therefore the more interesting for its evidence of the *ad Sanctos* habit of burial.

The phrase *iustitiae tramitem seruans* in No. 1644 could be paralleled many times from Augustine, with whom *trames* is a favourite idea (*In Ioan. Ev.* 15. 12; 124. 8; *Cur. Mort.* 10. 12; *C. Mendac.* 7. 17, etc., etc.).

to fasc. 4 under *Ecclesia catholica*. This is, however, only a matter of opinion; for the rest, the arrangement, annotation and the selection are excellent. And it is worth while mentioning the accuracy of the printing: there may be an odd misprint in the four fascicules, but if there is, it has eluded a careful reading—no small merit in a work of this nature.

J. H. Baxter.

* * * * *

Hippo Regius from the Earliest Times to the Arab Conquest. By Holmes van Mater Dennis. A Dissertation presented to the Faculty of Princeton University. Princeton University Press, 1924. Pp. 74.

This dissertation on the famous see of Augustine will possess a certain interest for students of the great African Father and of the African Church generally. Its thirteen short chapters cover a wide field: situation and topography, climate, ethnology, language, provincial and municipal status, government, diocese, bishops, councils, etc. The work is to be welcomed as an evidence of interest in a province where French scholarship has been supreme and English scholarship nowhere. The writer has read widely and amassed a goodly amount of information which the ordinary student hitherto has had to collect for himself from a hundred sources. This is the main value, and the sole value, of the dissertation; it is a compilation, claiming neither completeness nor originality. It is regrettable that the author deliberately excluded any discussion of the archæology of the town and of the relation of Augustine to his see: two topics whose absence makes his dissertation a *Hamlet* without the prince. But he promises to take up the second topic in a later study, and for this task we hope Mr. Dennis will add to his enthusiasm some spice of the critical faculty. It would also be advisable to reproduce one or other of the excellent large-scale maps of the district from the *Guide bleu* to Algeria or from Gsell's *Atlas archéologique*. But meanwhile this little book is not without its use.

J. H. Baxter.

CURRENT LITERATURE.

KEYS are more popular among students than among teachers, but not all students of a subject are under teachers, and such isolated workers are the better for possessing a reliable key to their text-book. This just judgment has led Professor J. E. McFadyen to publish a *Key to the Exercises in Davidson's Hebrew Grammar* (T. and T. Clark, 10*s*). Professor McFadyen has himself edited a revised edition of this standard Hebrew grammar, and no one is better fitted to prepare a key to its exercises. The book is full of sound, well-arranged information upon the Hebrew language. It is reasonable to hope that, as the editor remarks, those who work through the book honestly will be able to read and also to write Hebrew, "with a real appreciation of the subtler shades of meaning" in the prose and poetry of the Old Testament. This book will be indeed a boon to the diligent student.

* * * * *

Professor H. J. W. Hetherington's biography of *Henry Jones* (Hodder and Stoughton, 12*s*. 6*d*.) is a rare success. Sir Henry Jones has left an autobiographical fragment, it is true, but there was room for a succinct, vital sketch of his career, from the days when he was a shoemaker in Wales to the years when, as successor to Edward Caird, he taught moral philosophy in Glasgow University, and stamped his influence on many of his pupils. Professor Jones wrote real letters. His biographer has had the advantage of using them. Also, Jones touched many interests, social, literary, and political, and "his philosophy was immensely more winning for the power of his personal appeal," for he had a vivid personality. But even good materials like these do not necessarily mean a good biography; more is needed, and this has been forthcoming in the judgment and skill of Professor Hetherington. He has produced a biography that enables the reader to understand a living man. "I am always glad of Browning's phrase: 'Gladness be with thee, helper of the world.' Henry Drummond wired this to me when I was elected to St. Andrews; and many a time I have been thankful for the phrase." So Jones writes in a letter, in 1911. It is a phrase which suits his character and career. And Professor Hetherington's book brings out the innate nobility

of the Professor's spirit—a brave, unselfish, ardent helper of men to the truth of life as he saw it. I had left the University before Jones became professor, and only knew him in other spheres. But I recall a remark about him made, at an Oxford public dinner, by Sir Gilbert Murray, who had been one of his colleagues in Glasgow. "There are two kinds of men on a University Senate," Murray told us; "some you never meet except at Senate meetings, but some you meet afterwards. Jones was one of those whom I met afterwards." There is ample testimony, in this book alone, that his students as well as his colleagues found him human and friendly and wisely unofficial.

* * * * *

Father John Donovan publishes a pamphlet on *The Logia in Ancient and Recent Literature* (Cambridge: W. Heffer & Sons, 2*s*.), in which, after analysing the use of λόγια he concludes, with Professor Bacon, that the well-known extract from Papias does not justify us in supposing that Papias referred to any book of Logia, but that he simply meant Matthew's Gospel. The usage of Justin and Polykarp will still appear to many critics to imply that λόγια here denotes *Effata* of Jesus; some of them undoubtedly were enshrined in narrative, but the probability is that the term covers specifically the oracles or sayings of our Lord which enshrined his revelation. There is no linguistic argument in this pamphlet which is either new or convincing to the contrary, though the collection of passages is certainly convenient.

* * * * *

Mr. G. R. S. Mead's book, *The Gnostic John the Baptizer* (London: J. M. Watkins, 5*s*.), contains four discussions, more or less closely connected. The first is of the traditions about John the Baptist, a speculative account, which is followed by extracts from the later literature of the Mandæan sect on the lower Euphrates; in this gnostic patch Mr. Mead discovers several flowers of historical truth, quoting and translating from the German version of the "John-book" by the German scholar Lidzbarski. Then comes a section on the well-known Christian references in the Slavonic version of the *Antiquities* of Josephus, which Mr. Mead usefully translates from the German version by Johannes Frey, a scholar who sixteen years ago ventured

to argue in favour of some sound tradition behind them. Finally, Mr. Mead offers a new version of the prologue to the Fourth Gospel, translating "Logos" by "Mind." He thinks the original was in Aramaic verse. "Grace for grace" he renders "Delight over against Delight," arguing that this is a "distinct reference to the Gnostic notion of pairs and synzygies in the Plērōma," and there are other theosophic touches. Mr. Mead's belief is that "the study of the Mandæan documents cannot fail to come to the front as an indispensable task in the elucidation of the characteristic Gnosis as an integral and widely-diffused factor in the general history of religion in the critical centuries in the Near East and Mediterranean West before and after the beginnings of the present era." Even those who cannot agree to anything like this valuation of Mandæan gnosticism may be grateful for some of the materials which the author's indefatigable zeal has gathered within the pages of this volume.

* * * * *

Mr. Kennedy Williamson's short essays and poems in *The Uncarven Timbers* (Hodder and Stoughton, 6*s.* net) are a charming collection of prose pieces and verse, with plenty of variety, and with a fresh, crisp touch. There is a religious note, but it is never forced. For example, the little story, "Sauce for the Gander," is told, and no more; Mr. Williamson has the artistic sense to leave it as it is. Not every one would speak of "Pater's strong and sinewy prose," however, and occasionally Mr. Williamson's exegesis does not sound convincing. But these are quite minor points. He has written a cheerful, sound book of counsel, with a number of unhackneyed illustrations from literature and common life.

* * * * *

Mr. Marcus Woodward's book on *How to Enjoy the Countryside* (Hodder and Stoughton, 2*s.* 6*d.*) appears in winter. But he begins by showing how even at Christmas-time there is a wealth of interest about a farm for anyone who is trained to look. And this volume of the People's Library opens the eyes of those who are accustomed to streets and squares. Mr. Woodward has the knack of writing easily about nature; it is the ease of a well-informed mind. Tom Hughes once wrote, "All I say is you don't know your own lanes and woods and

fields." It is to free us from such a reproach that this charming little book has been written.

* * * * *

New editions are issued, by Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton, of Professor Hugh Black's *Culture and Restraint* (10*s*. 6*d*.) and Professor Carnegie Simpson's *The Fact of Christ* (3*s*. 6*d*.). Both works have already won their public, and both still make their appeal. The problem of adjusting self-expression and self-denial is always with us; Professor Black's pages discuss it with charm and good judgment. As for *The Fact of Christ*, since it was first issued twenty-five years ago, it has been translated into French, Italian, German, Spanish, Norwegian, Japanese, etc. The author modestly explains its popularity by its theme, but the steady demand for it proves that he has written a small book which helps people to understand how real and attractive our Lord is. Certainly, as he says, "The social gospel needs to be asserted and expounded to-day as it is not in this quarter of a century old book; but, equally certainly, that social gospel will never come to very much if the need for men themselves to deal face to face with Jesus Christ is left out." And *The Fact of Christ* lives because it does bring the reader directly before its great Subject.

* * * * *

The volume of selections from Stopford Brooke's prose and verse, entitled *Die to Live* (Hodder and Stoughton, 5*s*.), will recall to a large circle of readers the invigorating sermons which during the latter part of last century made such an impression in England. His son-in-law, Dr. L. P. Jacks, declares in a foreword that he knows of "nothing in the published literature of the modern pulpit that surpasses the best of Stopford Brooke for force, for fire, for copiousness, for sustained adequacy to the height and majesty of the theme." He certainly had a kindling impetus, and this is brought out in these well-chosen selections. Those who possess his earlier sermons, in particular, often turn to them for something which few preachers of the day seem to convey. But these volumes are not accessible, and this small book is therefore all the more valuable as a collection of characteristic utterances by one who ought not to be forgotten in this hurrying generation.

CURRENT ISSUES.

In January (p. 4) we referred to a new study of the Koran and its interpretative Traditions. The subject of Islam is, for obvious reasons, exciting special interest to-day, and the interest is not confined to statesmen. Another book by a Western scholar has just appeared, which directs attention to the social ethics of the Koran. It is by Dr. Robert Roberts, and is called *The Social Legislation of the Qoran.* But Dr. Roberts includes a comparative estimate of some ancient codes, including that of Israel, a feature which invests his book with particular significance.

* * * * *

One issue raised is in connexion with charity. It is a duty urged in the Qoran with special frequency, and Dr. Roberts points out, not only that the founder of Islam here "had in his mind the injunctions of the Jewish and Christian codes," but also that he taught, like the doctors of the Talmud, "that almsgiving makes atonement for sin." This latter doctrine differentiates Islam from Christianity. Yet it is only fair to remember that Muhammad qualified his doctrine. He warned his adherents, as Dr. Roberts shows, "against the thought that the fulfilment of this duty gives them a license to live unworthy lives. Rather it is only when this virtue is accompanied by such others as adorn human life that the giver has his reward."

* * * * *

There is one interesting extension and application of this principle. In the Old Testament wounds might be punished by the infliction of similar physical injuries upon the offender; "eye for eye, tooth for tooth, hand for hand, etc." (Exod. xxi. 23). So in Islam, though Mohammedan law improved on the Qoran by admitting a money payment in the case of wounds. But the prophet himself taught: "wounds should be punished by retaliation; but whoso remits it (as alms), it is an expiation for him." That is, a man acquires saving merit if he forgoes his

right to retaliation. This is a remarkable proviso. As Dr. Roberts argues, " although we believe that the prophet could have done much more than he did in order to abolish the cruel custom of retaliation, still when we remember to what extremes the Arabs went in the fulfilment of this duty, it must be confessed that Muhammad took a step in the right direction. His attempt, as far as it goes, was praiseworthy."

* * * * *

There are some indications that the tendency to depreciate Luke's historical value, in the Acts of the Apostles, has stirred a critical reaction. Eduard Meyer's rehabilitation of Paul's speech at Athens, against Norden's scepticism, is a sign of the times. And now Professor Burkitt enters an acute protest against the rather sweeping negations of Professors Lake and Jackson, in their *Beginnings of Christianity*.

* * * * *

Professor Burkitt's own book is called *Christian Beginnings*. And in the course of it he draws attention to one point in favour of Luke as a historian. In the beginning of Acts we read that for forty days after the resurrection Jesus spoke to the disciples " of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God." Luke does not enter into details. He simply generalizes. Which, according to Professor Burkitt, should be counted to his credit in all fairness.

* * * * *

Why ? Well, anyone who knows the later sub-apostolic literature, both gnostic and catholic, is aware how much use was made of this episode in the tradition of the Risen Christ. Even at the present day one sometimes hears ecclesiastics maintaining that this secret teaching included episcopacy, sacramentarianism, and everything thrown up in the later changes of the Church. When New Testament evidence is demanded for such innovation, the reply is that they were handed down by tradition from this special revelation of Jesus. The text in Acts is a convenient receptacle, into which you can put any doctrine or practice. This was done at an early stage. " Strange as it seems to us, a good many early Christians felt no scruple about making the Risen Christ a mouthpiece for their views." And Luke abstained from this.

* * * * *

It may sound a minor detail, in support of Luke's honesty, this abstinence from inventing revelations. But it tells seriously in his favour, and, as Professor Burkitt insists, it is one of the data which justify us in treating Acts as " an historical work, not a religious novel." Luke has left gaps in his story. He is not so interested, for example, in the internal life of the Pauline churches as we could have wished, and he drops Peter out of his story abruptly. Also, " the early part of Acts has in it something of the characteristics of a prose poem. But when we come to test it by the letters of Paul we find it to be historical, not fabulous." This has been often said before. But Professor Burkitt says it in full view of some contemporary criticism, and thus his opinion carries weight.

* * * * *

Dr. Radoslav A. Tsanoff has written a book on *The Problem of Immortality*, which claims that our personality at its truest has elements of value implying immortality. But this can only be held, he declares, if we abjure any deification of the Absolute ; we must have a dynamic conception of God. He would agree with Sir Henry Jones that " a God conceived as a static absolute cannot do anything, and is as little satisfactory as a God who is limited and imperfect."

* * * * *

Dr. Tsanoff, like Sir Henry Jones, is the philosopher as preacher. His book contains chapters of historical retrospect, but it is the work of one who is conscious of a message. He sets all his hopes on the moral aspirations which belong to personality at its best —or, as he would say, at its centre. Unless there is personal immortality, the essential elements of value in human life are frustrated, and these elements must be conserved in personal lives, not in general abstractions, as Comte and others would argue.

* * * * *

But what of those who seem to have very little aspiration in their insignificant personalities ? Kipling speaks of

> " The mere uncounted folk
> Of whose life and death is none
> Report or lamentation."

We turn over Dr. Tsanoff's pages, to discover how he deals with the problem of those who do not appear particularly qualified

for the immortality which he is describing. He faces the difficulty. You and I, he says, can understand our own immortality. But what of the man across the street, our undistinguished, unphilosophical brother ? What, in all seriousness, of the swarming millions who breed and perish on earth, often un-moral, or apparently devoid of moral cravings ?

* * * * *

Here, it is interesting to notice, Dr. Tsanoff draws upon a Christian conviction. His book is not concerned with the Christian argument for immortality, but, when he comes to plead that the humblest of individuals has something which is of value to the universe, he buttresses this faith in the individual, in any individual, by an appeal to the gospel. For this faith is, as he declares, " a prime essential of the Christian gospel," this concern for " the least of these my brethren." Such a phrase as " these my brethren " is the clue to the problem ; it shows us how we can appreciate the lasting value, not only of our own personalities but of other people. It is not to be confounded with a maudlin sentimentality. But it does posit worth in man as man. And to maintain it is a constant demand upon our faith. Philosophy may help the mind to see that this intuition is right, but, as Dr. Tsanoff quite frankly puts it, " if offhand scorn for the unchronicled multitude be a sign of shallow arrogance, the living trust in the eternal worth of each man can only be an act of faith."

* * * * *

Dr. Keller desires to supplement the bibliography of his study on " A Theology of Crisis " by the following references to recent monographs and articles :—

Karl Barth's *Die Auferstehung der Toten* (C. Kayser's Verlag, 1924).

Karl Barth's *Der Römerbrief* (2nd Ed., 1922).

Die christliche Welt, 1920–23, Marburg (a series of articles by Harnack, Jülicher Bertram and others).

Theologische Blätter (1922/23), articles by Tillich, Gogarten, Hein, and K. Schmidt.

Allg. Ev. Luth. Kirchenzeitung (36–40, 1924), articles by Girgensohn.

Protestantenblatt, articles by Schubring and others.

Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuse (1923), article by Strohl, S. 156 ff.
Zwischen den Zeiten, articles by Hirsch.
Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie, I, 4 (Althaus).
M. Rade, *Glaubenslehre*, 1924.
Erich Schaeder, *Das Geistproblem in der Theologie* (Deichert, Leipzig, 1924).
Martin Werner, *Das Weltanschauungsproblem bei Karl Barth und Albert Schweitzer*. Paul Haupt, Bern, 1924.
Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche (1923), articles by Knittermeyer, Wünsch, and F. W. Schmidt.
R. Bultmann, "Problem der Ethik bei Paulus," in *Zeitschrift für neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, 1924.
Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift, 1921 (an article by Bachmann, October 21).

THE THIRD COMMANDMENT.

III.

An interpretation of this text which is often adopted is that which regards it as a command against general profanity. One commentator, for example, says: "Not only false swearing, but every sinful use of the name Jehovah in curse, blasphemy, charm, divination, and every other frivolous use is forbidden." It may be that we have warrant for using this commandment as a peg on which we can hang a sermon against any and every form of profanity, but that is vastly different from saying that the literal meaning of the text, as it was understood by Jews, warrants us giving such a wide interpretation of it. In fact, there are one or two facts which positively militate against this liberal interpretation. In the first case, to say the very least, this wide interpretation is imported into the text: it is not brought out of it. Then again, all these laws are directed against serious offences, offences serious

enough in themselves, and, moreover, to which the sons of Israel easily fell victims. No one, for example, would deny the seriousness of theft, murder, adultery, and such-like crimes. They strike at the very roots of any and every form of stable political life. But profanity, even though it be a serious offence, is one of an entirely different order from those I have already mentioned. We may condemn profanity, and regard it as vulgar or even sinful, but only a man lacking in humour and a sense of proportion would regard it as being as sinful as murder or adultery. Moreover, the sin of profanity is not one against which Israel needed particularly to be warned. Many actions and forms of speech are regarded as profane by the Old Testament, but profanity, in the modern English sense of the term, does not seem to have caused an inordinate amount of trouble. Then, again, this crime, whatever it is precisely, is regarded as a very serious one. It is an almost unforgivable offence, for the commandment reads, "The Lord will not hold him guiltless who takes His name in vain." This crime is almost on the level of the sin against the Holy Ghost, spoken of by Jesus. Other sins may be forgiven, but not this. Severe punishments are promised in Scripture for the other offences, but in the Decalogue itself, the most serious crime of all is that of taking the name of the Lord in vain. And it must be said that it would be a code lacking completely in balance and a sense of proportion which regarded murder, adultery and idolatry as deserving of a less severe punishment than the use of bad language.

The word translated "in vain" probably means, in this context, "without result," and so, interpreted strictly, the commandment means, "Thou shalt not swear anything in the name of Jehovah without carrying it out." That is, we are forbidden to use God's name to give an air of sanctity to our promises and holiness to our life, unless

we are prepared to practise what we preach, and carry out what we have promised in the name of God.

If there was anything that was regarded as sacred by the Jew, it was the oath. That the making of oaths was not forbidden by the Old Testament can be seen quite easily. We are expressly told, "Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God, Him shalt thou serve, and to Him shalt thou cleave, and shalt swear by His name" (Deut. vi. 13, x. 20). That oaths were often made can be seen by the frequency with which we come across such expressions as these, "God do this to me, and more also," "Jehovah is a witness between me and thee," "as the Lord liveth, I will do this, that or the other." That an oath, whatever it cost, was considered binding, can be seen by the act of Jephthah, which no one condemned, who vowed as a thanksgiving to the Lord to sacrifice whatever met him first on his return home from battle, and finding it to be his daughter carried out the oath. The book of Ecclesiastes is very clear and true to the spirit of the Old Testament in the matter of oaths in saying, "When thou vowest a vow unto the Lord, defer not to pay it, for He hath no pleasure in fools; pay that which thou hast vowed. Better is it that thou shouldest not vow than that thou shouldst vow and not pay." Moreover, our Lord Himself, in that much disputed passage in Matthew, does not forbid the making of oaths. What He does forbid is the levity of the forms of swearing customary among the Jews at the time. They held, not that all oaths were forbidden, but that only vows in God's name were binding. That is, they considered that all other oaths could be broken with impunity. In contrast to them, Jesus impressed upon men the meaning of "Yea, yea," and "Nay, nay," and taught that the mere word should be as binding as any oath.

Perjury is looked at from a different standpoint to-day

than was the custom in ancient times. In Israel God was regarded as the founder, lawgiver and supreme magistrate of the community. Thus to use the name of God in making a promise was a very natural but, at the same time, a very serious practice. Religion and politics were one and the same. The law of God was the law of the State. And so the fear of God was the principle which lay behind truthful speaking. The State could exist and prosper only so long as God was revered and His law was honoured. The breaking of an oath was punished with very severe punishment because it was considered that it struck at the religious basis of the community, and was an insult to the God who ruled over it. Perjury is still regarded as a crime, though for different reasons. Truthfulness is an essential element in any community. Men can live together amicably and be of lasting service to each other only as they live together in truth. Fidelity to the plighted word is the indispensable condition of good government and sound commerce. The more developed any society is, the more far-reaching its business enterprise, and the more influence it has in the realm of international politics, the more it depends upon absolute veracity. For business men to regard their legal obligations as things to be lightly regarded ; for politicians to regard their promises to the people as mere springboards into power ; for governments to regard their treaties lightly, to make them with their eyes closed and to break them just as easily ; all that is to poison the atmosphere which makes the world one, and makes it possible for one country to enter into friendly relationships with others. To break one's oath after it has been made deliberately and with perfect knowledge of the consequences ; to regard lying as a matter of no importance ; all that is to spoil our character, to ruin all chances of making a success of life, and to eat away the very roots of the tree of brother-

hood and civilisation. It is because perjury shakes the foundations of all friendly relationship, and is the sworn enemy of social harmony, that it is punished, and rightly punished, with such severity in modern life.

It is not a crime to make an oath, or even to use God's name in making it. That is not to sin against this commandment. Oaths are made in the law courts thousands of times every week. Many men and women swear that, in their several occupations, they will be faithful in the discharge of their duties, and will not betray their trust. A solemn appeal to God to listen to our evidence and promise ought always to be solemnising. To call up deliberately before our minds the fact that we are God's; to remember that in a business transaction or in a criminal suit in the law courts or in the entrance upon a new sphere of life, we are in God's hands, is to make our promise much more sacred and our duty much more clear. A man who can make an oath in God's name and then deliberately break it, who can promise to tell the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth, and straightway proceed to give shady evidence or to browbeat a witness, is worthy of the severest punishment that can be meted out to him.

There are two conditions, at least, which are necessary to make an oath blameless on the part of a Christian. The first is that the oath should be the expression of an honest, free, unbiassed, believing mind. We must know exactly what we promise and why we promise it, and we must be more than reasonably certain that we can carry out the promise. The second condition is that the enterprise we enter upon should be such that a clear and educated conscience could sanction it. To carry out a bad oath merely because we have sworn, is to make potential sin into actual sin. To break one's promise, if the promise ought never to have been made, is obedience to the law of God, on con-

dition that we make our position perfectly clear to everybody concerned, and are prepared to indemnify any who suffer loss because of it. Real perjury, the breaking of a solemn oath, the denial of a political or business or family contract, is a twofold sin if the contract has been sanctified by the name of God.

As has already been mentioned, this commandment is generally supposed to be directed against the sin of ordinary common profanity, the silly and irreverent use of God's name in ordinary conversation. I suppose there is less reason than there used to be to speak against this habit. It was at one time, apparently, considered the mark of the gentleman to swear, get drunk and keep company with immoral women. One is thankful to see that the world is becoming wiser, and is regarding these practices as no longer the mark of the man of breeding, but rather as the mark of the man of coarseness and vulgarity. But though the fashion of society has changed somewhat, it is to be greatly questioned whether the principle behind the fashion has changed considerably. We cannot rely greatly upon a more refined taste unless we can be certain that it is the expression of a redeemed principle. One is forced, as a result of many things, to wonder whether the changed judgment of society on this matter is a solid and emphatic change, or whether it is based upon some policy less certain than a contempt for impurity, a reverence for God, and a respect for His laws. When swearing and filthy language were condemned only by the Third Commandment it was considered the sign of the man about town to indulge in them ; now they are condemned by the laws of good society it is considered the sign of vulgarity and bad breeding to indulge in them.

The attitude of much of our modern literature in this respect is rather remarkable. Religious people are held up

to scorn because they do not show themselves to be as noble in practice as they are in theory. The least failing is regarded as a sign of hypocrisy or as a proof of the weakness inherent in religion. And together with that, there has come about a kind of respect for those people who are openly immoral and profane. The theory is, I suppose, that religious people are either prudish and impossibly narrow, or else that they are hypocritical and practise in private what, in public, they condemn. Many novelists and dramatists look for their heroes and heroines among the social pariahs. Harlots are described as though they were paragons of virtue, and, if wrong, then more the victims of circumstance than of evil will, and "gentlemen cracksmen" as though they were men of honour, wit and resource. We ought to be quite ready to acknowledge the purity that is to be found in the most immoral of people, and to recognise honour even when it is found among thieves, but the manifest aim of a good deal of modern fiction and drama is to manage the story in such a way that religious people shall show themselves to be hypocrites, and men and women of ill-repute shall prove themselves worthy of honour and praise. Lust and intrigue are pictured with all the glamour of passion surrounding them, so that the sordid and the cruel are forgotten in the heroic and the brazen.

Profanity, immorality and intemperance would probably cause much less trouble than they do, if only young men and women would be sensible, and would be content to be young. These offences are often committed by them for no other purpose and with no other object in view than to show that they have progressed beyond the period of childhood. They have steeped themselves in a literature which is sceptical in the matters of religion and cynical over purity. It is no exaggeration to say that crowds of girls and young men drink their port, not because they like it or feel a need

of it, but just to be able to brag about it afterwards. Young men tell filthy stories in the train, not because they have any relish for them, but because they think it is the manly thing to do. I have heard of one lad committing immorality because he wished to boast that he had done so. The world has not yet learned the truth that manliness and superiority to religious fear are not synonymous terms.

Another way in which we break this commandment is by making light of sacred things and using them as an opportunity of displaying our deluded wit. Of course, wit is not to be condemned. It is not wrong to use wit in the service of religion so long as it is good wit. And to use poor wit is just as bad as, and no worse than, to use poor logic and poor poetry. Learning, science, imagination, the gift of language, poetry, sarcasm—they all have their place, and they ought all to be used, so long as they are well used. The day of the ignorant ministry has gone long ago. And the day of the dull one is quickly passing. It is not sinful even to make merry over some people's religious opinions. Many are impervious to solid argument. They have no respect for scholarship. They are entirely beyond the reach of poetry. And for imagination they have a peculiar contempt. The only thing to do with some people is to laugh at them, to knock the bottom out of their arguments by means of ridicule. The Christian Church is simply crowded with queer sects which exist for no other purpose than to propagate some ridiculous little idea of their own. There are men and women in nearly all our churches whose religious and Biblical theories have nothing to commend them except their sheer absurdity. There are many who forget that theology is one of the most difficult of sciences, and who glory in the fact that they alone can read the secrets of God. If they would keep their theories to themselves, we might safely allow them to live and die in undisturbed

enjoyment of their discoveries, but seeing that they generally cry their ideas aloud wherever they go, and prove themselves to be an unconscionable nuisance to men and women who are endeavouring bravely to spread culture and Biblical enlightenment within the Church, there is nothing for us to do except to show how ridiculous they are. So long as there are people in the churches who are lacking in a sense of humour, it is the duty of those who possess it to use it in order to suppress them.

Jesus possessed humour and the power of sarcasm, and He was not afraid of using them. He used them to show up people's foibles, and to make fun of their foolish ideas. In one of His metaphors, He gives us the picture of a little man, a very little man, a very conceited little man, standing on tiptoe, pulling up his arms, sticking out his chin, trying to appear to be a few inches taller than he really was. Jesus was dealing with people who had foolish ideas. It was useless arguing with them, and so He made fun of them. What He could not get by intellect He got by wit.

It is one thing to make fun of religious people. Many of us need it, and it does most of us good. But it is quite another thing to make fun of religion. There are sacred factors in life, and their sanctity must be preserved at any cost. Flippancy in the face of the real facts of life, contempt for or cynicism concerning what is divine, that is moral death. Life itself is serious, life's work and duties and responsibilities, and to treat them scornfully, contemptuously or flippantly, is to border upon that sin of profanity which is so severely regarded by the Decalogue. Religion is serious. And yet there is no need to be more than moderately acquainted with the modern novel to learn that multitudes regard it as one of the most humorous elements in life. There seems to be something perennially funny to many people in the thought of the chapel deacon who

is famous for his windy prayers and uncultured ways, or in the picture of the simple country curate with a weakness for ladies and tea. One would welcome the humour as salutary if it were possible to recognise the note of sincerity in it, but, generally speaking, the deacon and the curate are nothing but the scapegoats of a class. They are supposed to be the representatives of the religion which is really being attacked. Marriage is serious. And yet there is no song or joke which calls forth a louder laugh than one which makes fun of marriage. To some poor minds there is something perennially funny about the thought that a couple should come to blows during their honeymoon, or that marriage should end in children. The twentieth century is so lacking in humour that it cannot laugh unless it hears jokes about the serious elements in life. It is true that some of the most brilliant sarcasm and the subtlest humour is the outcome of a spirit that is so crushed that it can do little else but laugh. But the wit is often so brilliant, and the sarcasm is often so biting, and the moral intensity is often so manifest, that the people who ought to read it do not, and only those read it who have sympathy with it. But a good deal of our modern humour is neither brilliant nor morally intense; it is the expression of men and women who do not know the difference between humour and vulgarity, and whose flippant pens do more harm to religion and morality than those of men and women who are positively opposed to both. There is probably less harm done to pure religion to-day by agnostics and agnostic literature than there is by poor Christian living and sentimental Christian writing. Less harm is done to life by those who are deliberately cynical and sceptical, and who put the searchlight on the sins of society, than is done by the cheap love novel with its babyish talk and its total inability to understand the dignity of married life.

To picture sacred subjects in a way that can fill intelligent people only with a feeling of contempt ; to make a mockery of idealism ; to point the finger of scorn at those who are doing their solid best to live a pure life ; to take by our ignorant talk the solemnity from life and the sacredness from death : this is to run the grave danger of breaking the Third Commandment. Any mockery of life or scoffing at its duties and responsibilities is to dishonour God and to bring His name into disrepute.

But there is a positive side to this commandment as well as a negative. We have in it a principle of far-reaching significance. We have already seen that it gives the basis of Old Testament morals. What is the ultimate ethical ideal is a problem that has taxed the intellects of the finest thinkers of all time. Some have declared for happiness, and have said that the goal of all living and legislation is the greatest happiness of the greatest number. Others have come down on the side of conscience, and have declared that we have no right to accept a law or principle as binding upon ourselves unless we can apply it to the whole race. Others have declared for self-realisation, and told us to live and not merely talk about living, to pack eternity into time, and to be and do everything we have in us to be and do. And just as the ultimate ethical ideal has been defined in several different ways, so the concrete duties of life have been regarded as equally uncertain. The ordinary plain man expects from the moralist to be told what he is to do when he gets up to-morrow morning, and the moralist, if he gives an answer at all, will give it in terms of his own particular ideal. Looked at from the point of view of the Decalogue, the particular problems of thought and life fall properly into their places when once we have the ultimate ideal right in our minds. If our attitude to God were what it ought to be, the study of our attitude to the par-

ticular problems of life would be made much easier than it is. If we regarded the honouring of the name of God as being of such paramount importance that all other interests shrivelled up by the side of it, we should find that our attitude to the thousand and one tasks of life would settle itself automatically. From the standpoint of the Old Testament, the mere moralist is absorbed in the Servant of God.

In our strenuous endeavours to observe precepts we are apt to forget principles. Many are so enthusiastic over the desire to serve God, that they forget what supremely God requires them to do. It is hard to learn that love is the fulfilling of the law. We refrain from taking the name of God in vain when we have a reverence which touches the very springs of the character. We honour God when our lives are worthy: we dishonour Him when they are unworthy. God is the King of all our life, King of our body and our heart, King of our conscience and intellect, King of our home and business, King of the Church and the State. We do honour to God when, in all aspects of our life, we show obedience to His will and loyalty to His law. Honouring is more than an attitude of speech: it is the mental and spiritual bent of the whole life. God requires to be King of every man, and King of everything in every man. He is to be the guest in every home, the buyer in every shop, the overseer in every mill, the judge in every court, the reader of all our literature, and the supreme God over all our social life.

We often find men and women who chafe under the burdens of their ordinary daily life, and with real meaning they sing, "Oh, my spirit longs and faints for the converse of thy saints." They look upon business, to judge by their speech, as a painful necessity, a kind of profanation, the prostitution of a sacred mind and body to secular uses, and

when they come to church it seems as if they have migrated from one world to another. And when they express such keen delight that they can forget their business when they come to church, they raise just a vestige of suspicion in your mind that they forget their church when they go to business. What is not prayed about is not worth praying about. If a man cannot bring his business before God in prayer, he ought to take speedy steps to get rid of it. He is dishonouring God by being engaged in it. More is demanded by God than that we should reverence Him in what we technically call "public worship." We have to show Him reverence at all times and in all places, in our homes, in our playing fields, in our mill, in our shop, in all we eat, and say, and buy, and sell and make. I see nothing particularly honouring to God in going to a church two or three times a week, and taking part in a certain form of worship and preaching a couple of sermons or listening to some one else preach them. These actions, in and by themselves, are of no significance whatever, and have nothing to do with the glorifying of God. It is only as these services are related to our daily life that they acquire significance. It is only as we gain power on one day to live like strong saints the other six, that we keep the Sabbath holy. If we do not realise that we have to honour God in the performance of our daily work, whatever that work may be, we stand very little chance of honouring Him in church.

In the history of religion there has been revealed over and over again a fatal tendency to separate certain people off for holy offices, and to regard them as living a more saintly life than their fellows. The classical example of this tendency is to be found in the Roman Catholic practice of celibacy, the marriage of the priest or nun to the Church, and the consequent refusal to enter into the normal married state. Apart altogether from the fact that this is to put

an unnatural restraint upon thousands of otherwise normal human beings, and that it goes dead against what we may justly regard as the divine order of marriage, it is absolutely false in claiming that the "religious life" is of a higher order and a more saintly character than that lived by ordinary people. It is not by refusing to enter into the normal relationships of life, but by carrying the spirit of Christ into all life's functions, that we fulfil His commands. The Roman Church may, from some points of view, have made a wise move in demanding celibacy from the clergy, but in making it they have brought it to pass that their spiritual advisers know nothing at all of one of the most sacred functions of human life. The result is obvious. Nearly all Catholic writers on the ethics of marriage show themselves to be quite out of touch with reality. It is a false antithesis that is drawn between the priest and the layman, or between the sacred and the secular, and I, for one, regard with the utmost contempt and suspicion the constant attempts that are made to attach priestly functions to Nonconformist ministers. Rank the ministry as high as it is possible to rank it. But every profession and trade ought to be regarded as demanding the same honesty, devotion, painstaking attention and careful study as that of the ministry of the Church. If a man cannot honour God in the place that God or circumstances have put him, his one duty is to take speedy steps to get somewhere else. We need not change our professions when we decide to honour God as we have never done before. And we need not drag our religion in from the outside and make a parade of it. All work is sacred, so long as it is honourable and is done well. A lawyer serves God by being an honourable and upright lawyer, a preacher serves God by being a diligent and faithful preacher, a tradesman serves God by being a true and worthy tradesman.

We must reverence God, reverence Him in thought, in word, in action, in business, in town, in country, throughout life. We must regard the honouring of God as the one object of life, and then translate it into terms of action and speech. Nothing less than that will satisfy the demands made upon us by this Commandment.

H. J. Flowers.

THE RECONSTRUCTION OF THE APOCALYPSE: A CRITICISM.

The *Revelation of St. John the Divine* easily takes its place among the most fascinating subjects of study which are to be found in the whole range of world-literature. The boldness of its imagery, the splendour of its colouring, the surpassing grandeur of its theme, together with the unsolved if not insoluble problems which it presents to the student, combine to present a theme worthy of the best intelligence that can be brought to bear upon the task of its exposition. Among those who have undertaken to resolve its mysteries many blind guides are to be found, and it is perhaps needless to say that more nonsense has been written about this book than any other portion of Holy Scripture, with the possible exception of the apocalypse of Daniel. But, while the stream of nonsense still tirelessly babbles on, during the last few years not a little first-rate work upon *Revelation* has been done, though an entirely satisfactory exposition is still a *desideratum*, and no quite adequate solution of all its problems has yet been given to the world. The last seal has not yet been broken, and it is as yet impossible to say that the mystery of the Apocalypse is a mystery no longer.

Among the several works dealing with this subject, which have appeared since the publication of Archdeacon Charles's

great work, two stand out as peculiarly worthy of attention. With one of these, a very suggestive and helpful little volume by Canon Glazebrook, this paper is not concerned; the other, which is from the pen of Principal Oman, we shall consider in some detail. Small as it is, but 168 pages in all, Dr. Oman's *Book of Revelation* is of first-rate interest and importance. It is certainly one of the most striking contributions to the literature of the Apocalypse that has appeared of late, and one which no serious student of the subject can afford to overlook. It has the outstanding merit of challenging thought at almost every point, and that in spite of the fact that the author's conclusions, so far at any rate as the present writer is concerned, almost everywhere fail to carry conviction.

Rather more than twenty years ago it fell to my lot to review, in terms of the highest appreciation, Principal Oman's *Vision and Authority*, a volume which revealed itself as being the work of a thinker of first-rate ability and power. It is now, unhappily, out of print. Other volumes have followed, and Dr. Oman's reputation as a philosophic theologian has become established beyond question, though heretofore he has concerned himself but little with textual questions such as that discussed in his latest volume. How he came to turn his attention to a line of investigation so widely divergent from that along which he had previously wrought, Dr. Oman informs us in his preface. It is an interesting story, for the details of which our readers must be referred to the volume itself. Here it must suffice to say that a careful study of the Apocalypse led Dr. Oman to the conclusion that it is the work of a single author. The text, however, as known to us to-day, has become seriously disarranged, hence the confusion of thought which in certain places, it reveals. The secret of this confusion Dr. Oman believes that he has discovered, and

that he can supply the necessary correction. The result is a rearrangement of the subject matter of *Revelation*, which, in this most interesting little volume is now given to the world. This rearrangement, Dr. Oman claims, gets rid of the confusion which has for centuries darkened vision, and rendered the work of successful interpretation well-nigh impossible. Now at last, the student is assured, it is possible to present the subject-matter of the Apocalypse in a form at once simple and coherent.

It may perhaps, at this point, be of advantage to indicate the form in which the Apocalypse appears when Principal Oman's rearrangement is complete. The following outline will perhaps make sufficiently clear the general plan of the work.

1. Situation of the Church and the Theme of Prophecy (i. 9–iii. 22, x. 1–10, xxii. 6–8a, x. 11).

2. Two Aspects of the Era of World Empire.

(*a*) Prophetic witness during this Era (xi. 1–13).

(*b*) The Invisible Conflict and the Forces Engaged (xii. 1–xiv. 5).

3. Approach of the Time for the Overthrow of World-Rule.

(*a*) Five Empires embodying it have fallen, and now it is to end with fall of its present form, the Roman Empire (xv. 5–xvi. 16, xix. 11–16, xiv. 19–20, xix. 17–21, vi. 2–17).

(*b*) Corrupt Worldly Civilization Obliterated in Chaos : World Rule ends (xvi. 17–xix. 9).

4. Room made for Rule of God in Holy Jerusalem : the Thousand Years (xxi. 9–xxii. 5, xxii. 10–17, xiv. 15, xix. 9–10, xx. 1–10).

5. Millennial Rule ends with Separation of Saints and Sinners.

(*a*) Opening of Book of Life in Heaven ; Manifestation of the Sons of God (iv. 1–vi. 1).

(*b*) Roll Call of Saints : Sealing against Woes (vii. 1–4, 9–17).

6. The Woes : their Lessons for Seer's Contemporaries (viii. 1–6, 13, ix. 1–21, xi. 14–19, xiv. 6–12).

7. End of Present Order : the Final State.

(*a*) Reaping of the Harvest of Earth (xiv. 13–19a, xv. 1–4).

(*b*) Final Judgement and Final State (xx. 11–xxi. 8).

The original editor, to whom is due the arrangement of *Revelation* in its traditional order of subject-matter, is regarded by Principal Oman as having himself contributed an Introduction (i. 1–8) and an Epilogue (xxii. 18–21).

The above outline, while making no claim to pedantic exactness, will perhaps suffice to enable the reader to study the Apocalypse in what Dr. Oman regards as being its original sequence of subject-matter, and thus to escape from the confusion due to editorial incompetence.

When Dr. Oman began to rearrange the sections of the Apocalypse in order to attain to what he conceived to be some measure of intelligibility, he had not proceeded far before he observed that the sections which he desired to move were of something like equal length. It flashed upon his mind forthwith that he had discovered the clue to the whole mystery of the text. The Apocalypse had evidently been written in sheets, that is to say it was in the form of a codex, not of a roll. The sheets had become disarranged, a point quite overlooked by the early editor, to whom we owe the Apocalypse in its present form ; and all that remained was to discover the original order of the sheets. This Principal Oman claims to have done, and the outline given above represents the Apocalypse in the form in which the Seer intended it to go forth to the Christian world.

It must be frankly admitted that Dr. Oman has done his

work with a skill that is little less than amazing; yet it must be said that, so far at all events as the writer of this paper is concerned, the result is unconvincing, and challenges objection rather than commands acceptance. Principal Oman's method will not commend itself to all his readers; it is too subjective, and reveals far too much of the spirit which, instinctively perhaps rather than deliberately, assumes that, if facts do not square with theory, so much the worse for the facts, a spirit which inevitably vitiates the result of any investigation, however great the ability and learning with which it is carried out. The text is handled, in matter of fact, with a freedom and a boldness which undermine confidence in the result. If a section is too long, this is explained as being due to the presence of editorial glosses; and it is skilfully primed down to standard length, though the textual evidence for retention is good.[1] It is impossible to withold a tribute of admiration for the skill that has been displayed in this work; but it none the less remains true that, if it be permissible to handle historical texts in this subjective and very daring fashion, much can be done in the way of making an ancient writer say pretty well anything that his modern editor is of opinion that he ought to have said. It is indeed a cavalier way of getting rid of the difficulties presented by the Apocalypse in its traditional form; and as we contemplate the finished work leaves us not a little uncertain as to how much of the result is to be attributed to the Seer, and how much to his latest editor.

Within the restricted limits of this paper it is impossible

[1] Dr. Oman, however, can be strangely punctilious about the true text upon occasion. As for instance when he remarks, with reference to the opening words of xxii. 18, that the text may be either *I* or *we*, thus rendering it "impossible to be certain whether we ought to speak of editor or of editors." Yet in this particular case the evidence is such as to leave no doubt in the mind of the Revisers that the singular is to be preferred.

to discuss the many points raised by Principal Oman which are obviously open thereto. All that can be attempted is to give some illustrations of our author's methods and practice, in the hope that some at least of our readers will procure this most interesting and stimulating book, and investigate further on their own account.

In Principal Oman's own words, "the germ of the discovery—if it can be dignified by that name—upon which this reconstruction of the Apocalypse is based, was the view that the women of xii. 6 and xvii. 1 must be parallel conceptions. One sits in state in the wilderness, as her native dominion; the other flees into the wilderness, where she lives in exile from her heavenly home. One is a city, Babylon the Great; the other is at least related to the Holy Jerusalem. The Seer is carried into the wilderness to see the former." This last touch Dr. Oman considers to have been suggested by the second (Lucan) temptation of our Lord, but, as it appears, without any adequate ground. Still less obvious is the connection between the Mother of the Man-child and Holy Jerusalem, for which there appears to be no real evidence at all. The parallel as a whole impressed us as being the result of not a little straining, and is rather clever than convincing. Even less convincing is Dr. Oman's identification of the Man-child with the true righteous rule of His mother, a thesis supported by an appeal to Micah iv. 7–10, which, apart from one more or less superficial point of resemblance, that may possibly have suggested the symbol of the Mother of the Man-child, though this is by no means certain, appears to belong to an entirely different universe of discourse. The woman herself is interpreted as "the God- or Christ-rule, as the woman who sits in the wilderness is the world-rule." The latter is further described as being related to the Beast upon which she sits very much as the woman of xii. 1 is

related to the Man-child. To this it may be objected not unfairly that the Beast is never represented as being the offspring of his rider, a very vital point of difference which renders the parallelism something more than incomplete. With reference to the mother of the Man-child we are also informed that "the wings of the great eagle, which carry her to safety in the wilderness must be a reference to the fourth living creature which is like an eagle." The "must be" of this last sentence involves an assumption which is, to say the least of it, bold; for it assumes as axiomatic, if not proved, an identification which certainly requires proof, and is, in fact, in the last degree improbable. It is far simpler and more natural to see in the eagle's wings the adoption of a metaphor familiar enough in Hebrew thought, as may be seen by reference to some such passages as Exodus xix. 4, Deuteronomy xxxii. 11, Psalms ciii. 5, Isaiah xl. 31. To most of our readers, we believe, this line of interpretation will appear sufficiently obvious. When it is added that "if the living creatures, as is probable, represent the four elements of nature—earth, fire, water, air—this is the air, now purified by the fall from it of the powers of evil," we can but say that the former is again an unproved assumption, in our opinion a most unlikely one, while the latter does not help us greatly, for it still leaves us entirely in the dark as to how the purified air aids the woman. As an explanation of an admittedly difficult passage Dr. Oman's argument is at once unconvincing and needless, for by accepting the natural symbolism of the eagle's wings, as suggested by frequent Old Testament usage, we are saved from the tangle of improbabilities involved in this new interpretation, interesting and original as we may admit it to be. We have, however, dwelt quite long enough upon a single episode, and although there are several other points to which it would be interesting to

refer, it is time to pass on to other topics which claim a share of our attention.

The drastic character of the textual changes made necessary by Principal Oman's theory of equal sections may be illustrated by his treatment of the Seven Trumpets passage. With some other recent expositors he reduces the seven trumpets to three ; and in his version viii. 2, which opens the episode, reads, " Then I saw the seven angels who stand before God, and three trumpets were given them." The reader is entitled to ask on what authority the " seven " of the Revised Text has been altered to " three " There is no MS authority, so far as one can ascertain, and there is no variant reading. This inevitably leads to the conclusion that Dr. Oman has shouldered the responsibility of altering the text of an unquestioned passage because, as it stands, it does not support the interpretation that he has adopted. This is conjectural emendation raised to the highest power, a proceeding which it is difficult to justify ; for if the commentator is to be at liberty to alter the text commented upon of his own mere motion, and upon purely subjective grounds, he can get any interpretation he likes out of a passage. Thus, the first trumpet is sounded by the fifth angel, and to account for the preceding four the reader is somewhat clumsily referred back to vii. 1. Dr. Oman's justification for the view which he maintains, gathered from various references in different parts of his book, may be summed up under the following heads: (1) " The first four angels will be shown afterwards to fulfil another task," i.e. holding back the four winds of the earth (vii. 1). But in matter of fact they are not so employed at the moment referred to in viii. 2. They were bidden to restrain the forces of destruction until the sealing of the servants of God was complete, and that work was already completed before we come to viii. 2, following Dr. Oman's own rearrange-

ment. (2) " The senseless destruction of thirds . . . shows that ' three ' existed in the text, and that when the editor replaced it by ' seven,' he resolved to make good compensation." This argument is far from being conclusive, and it is somewhat difficult to take it seriously. There is, moreover, an exact parallel to the use of " thirds " in this passage in vi. 8, which has been suffered to escape censorship. Whether " thirds " or " fourths " the symbolism of these fractions is fairly obvious. (3) " The passage is marked by a feebleness of thought and expression unlike the resource and vigour of the author." This, of course, is a matter of opinion ; but, even allowing that there is some truth in the remark, its argumentative value is small. In the writing of allegory or similar forms of literary expression, it is extremely difficult to maintain a uniformly high level. Readers of *The Holy War* must have been struck with the inferiority of the latter part of that work, as compared with the earlier. But this has never been urged as a reason for supposing that the concluding portion of *The Holy War* is the work of an editor. (4) The first woe destroys (viii. 7) very things which are not to be hurt by the fifth (ix. 4). It would not be unfair to argue that in a symbolic work of the type of the Apocalypse literary consistency is hardly to be looked for ; but, waiving that point, it still remains that, in the traditional work, these two passages are in no sense contradictory, for the destruction in the earlier passage touched but a third part of the whole. The " clumsy thirds " thus tell rather against than in favour of the view which they are cited to support.

The real significance of this ruthless handling of the text of the Apocalypse becomes apparent in the statement " that there are only three woes is made certain by the precision of the result when the first four are omitted. The three sections then consist of thirty-three lines each,

with precisely two words over." The equal sheets theory is evidently the determining factor of the text of the message of the Apocalypse so far as Dr. Oman's rearrangement and alterations are concerned.

It will be observed, on reference to the outline given in a previous paragraph, that Dr. Oman's rearranged Apocalypse opens with chapter i., following the traditional order to the end of chapter iii. Certain words and passages are omitted, less however on textual grounds than in the interest of the equal length of sections theory ; the sections are indeed by this means brought within the necessary limits, but at the cost of the sonorous beauty and appeal of the letters in their familiar form. The letters are followed by x. 1, and it is claimed that this latter passage not only makes a natural sequence, but forms part of the same experience. To some readers perhaps this will not appear obvious. The transition from the close of the Laodicæan letter to " Then I saw . . . another angel—one of strength " hardly gives an impression of continuity. Commenting upon the word " another " Principal Oman contends that there is no other angel in the traditional connexion of x. 1. This, however, is hardly correct ; and it may be urged with some confidence that x. follows ix. far more smoothly and naturally, so far as diction is concerned, than iii. 22. In the rearranged order " another " still requires explanation, and that far more urgently than in the traditional sequence of passages. The angel required Dr. Oman finds in i. 10. But is He of the Trumpet Voice an angel ? No angel is mentioned, and the circumstances and context more than suggest that the mighty speaker is no mere angel but the Living Christ Himself. Thus it appears that not the traditionalist but Dr. Oman is left without the antecedent angel necessary to account for " another " in x. 1. The whole argument on this

point, which it is at present impossible to further discuss, appears to be singularly unconvincing.

The heavenly vision of chapters iv. and v., which to many readers will appear to be a very natural introduction to all that follows, and to present no great difficulty to the expositor, has been moved into a new portion, 5 (*a*) in the analysis given above. It will also be observed that vi. 1, in separation from its traditional context, has been included in this section, an arrangement gravely open to question. The sixth chapter, it will be generally admitted, reads as a literary whole, and the detachment of the first verse contributes to mar the symmetry and beauty of a passage which, as a whole, has suffered not a little at Dr. Oman's hands. The section, with which we are at present more immediately concerned, will thus conclude with the call of the Living Creature "Come and see." Dr. Oman prefers this rendering to the better attested "Come," which is accepted as preferable by Westcott and Hort and the Revisers' text. The words "and see" are retained in Dr. Oman's version less on textual grounds than because they afford a convenient link of connexion with the passage that immediately follows, "Thereafter I saw four angels" (vii. 1). But the link is a poor one at the best; the mere presence of the verb "see" in these two passages, in view of its frequent use in the *Apocalypse*, is worth very little for this purpose. The appeal to it does, however, illustrate the extent to which preconceived theory may influence the judgement of a very able man.

For the remainder of the Seals passage, with the exception of the breaking of the seventh seal, which is found in a much later context, it is necessary to turn back to 3 (*a*) of the Analysis—but only to find that it has ceased to be a Seals passage at all. The call of the Living Creatures which, repeated again and again, forms a strong link of con-

nexion between vi. 1 and the following verses is dismissed as a gloss, so likewise the phrase "When He had opened the second seal" and its parallels right to the end of the chapter. Without a shadow of real evidence, this wonderful chapter, familiar to us from childhood, is mutilated beyond recognition, and is separated from chapters iv. and v., which form a natural and intelligible approach to this, the first *dénouement* of the Apocalypse. It is all remarkably clever and original, too original in fact, as it appears to transgress the limits of legitimate conjecture, and fails to carry conviction by reason of its *a priori* and subjective character.

There are many other matters which it would be of interest to consider at length, but considerations of space render it impossible to enter upon them here. There are, however, one or two points of detail which call for at least a passing mention before we conclude.

It profits little to remove one difficulty while creating another. It cannot be gainsaid that, in the traditional version, the transition to xvi. 15 is abrupt, involving a change of subject, for Jesus Himself is obviously the speaker of the words "Behold, I come as a thief." To obviate this difficulty Dr. Oman makes xvi. 15 follow xxii. 16. This change no doubt meets this particular difficulty, but it does not help us a great deal, as it raises another of a precisely similar kind. For in its new connexion xvi. 15 is followed by xix. 9b–10, an utterance which—in spite of Dr. Oman's modification, on what authority, other than his own sense of the fitness of things, we are unaware—can hardly be imagined as falling from the lips of our Lord, who is certainly the speaker in xvi. 15. Thus we are left with precisely the same difficulty, an abrupt change of subject, as that with which we started. This particular rearrangement therefore helps us little.

In his exposition of various points of detail Dr. Oman

not infrequently adopts a tone of assurance which the facts of the case hardly justify. Commenting upon Jezebel of Thyatira, for instance, it is very definitely asserted that, in that Church, "a woman had arisen who declared that she had received by inspiration a commission to teach that Christians could take part in the idolatrous worship, and even share in the pagan festivals, without contamination." This, it may be frankly admitted, is a possible inference from the description of ii. 20, but it certainly should not be enunciated as if it were the only possible explanation, or even the most probable, which we do not believe it to be. It is more in harmony with the general tone and spirit of the letter to see here not a direct reference to an individual, but the symbolic use of the name of a notorious woman to suggest a tendency or attitude of mind inimical to the best interests of the Church in Thyatira.

To give another illustration; we are by no means convinced that the "ten days" of the Smyrnan letter is to be understood to mean ten years; nor that the fifty-two months or 1,260 days (xi. 2–3) indicates a period of 1,260 years, which, however, Dr. Oman apparently accepts as the duration of the era of World-Empire. This interpretation is not altogether easy to harmonise with the facts of history and is at the best gravely open to question. Speaking of World-Rule, it may be observed that xvii. 10, a crucial passage, is rendered "And they are seven monarchies. The five have fallen, the one still is, the other has not yet come." "Monarchies" as the English equivalent of *βασιλεῖς* is unusual, and appears little capable of justification on philological grounds, and in the next verse but one it gives place to the usual "kings." Waiving the philological question, it is at least improbable that the author of the Apocalypse should use the same word in two different meanings within the space of a few lines. But, be that

as it may, the use of the word "monarchies" in xvii. 10 indicates clearly enough that Dr. Oman does not accept the very general interpretation of this passage as having reference to a succession of Cæsars; it is rather, to use his own words, an intimation that "five empires have passed, Rome still is, and one is yet to follow." This view is, of course, not exactly novel, but, all things considered, is less satisfactory than the more usual explanation noted above, though even that is something less than absolutely convincing and lacks finality. The most striking point, however, in Dr. Oman's discussion of this topic is his contention that the outpouring of the Seven Vials—which in his rearranged version immediately precedes—is closely associated with the fall of the seven world-empires. This remarkable thesis has been ingeniously worked out, though the arguments cited in its support will not always commend themselves, and the result is far from being convincing. The empires in question, it may be mentioned, are Egypt, Sodom, Babylon, Persia, Greece, Rome, and a seventh which is not very clearly defined, but appears to be world-rule in a more or less general sense.

In the opinion of the majority of students of the Apocalypse the judgements which follow upon the outpouring of the vials, so far as they can in any way be associated with past events, will appear to be suggested, in form at least, by the plagues of Egypt, which again and again they strikingly recall. This, however, is not the view of Dr. Oman, for whom they have associations of a character entirely different, linking themselves on, in order, to the seven empires mentioned in the preceding paragraph. There is of course no great difficulty in forming the first link with Egypt (xvi. 2). It is, however, far less easy to forge the next link, connecting the second vial with Sodom. Dr. Oman does, indeed, admit that Sodom is the great difficulty

in his catalogue, but it is vital to his argument, for if that link fails the whole chain is involved. Gallantly as he sets about the difficult task, the result of his labour does not carry the reader very far, and naturally so, for no amount of special pleading can effect impossibilities, or avail to establish a place for Sodom in a catalogue of the world-empires of the past. It may, however, be of interest to study Dr. Oman's treatment of this point a little more closely. The result of the outpouring of the second vial was that the "sea became as the blood of a dead man." The problem is to find a reference to Sodom in these words. It would be more natural to find in them a re-echo of the first Egyptian plague, and this the context appears to suggest. But, if that be the case, so much the worse for the context. Without a shadow of real evidence the latter part of xvi. 3 "and every living soul died, even the things that were in the sea" is promptly gotten rid of as an editorial gloss, and the word "blood" is similarly discarded from xvi. 3a. The first step towards Sodom has thus been taken, for the verse now reads, "The second angel poured out his vial upon the sea; and it became as of one dead," or otherwise "a sea as of a dead man." This is a manifest reference to the Dead Sea, which at once suggests Sodom. Dr. Oman's methods of conducting us thither are high-handed and violent, and are not such as serve to give the student any real confidence that he has actually arrived at the intended goal. He will, moreover, be still less confident when he calls to mind that the Seer had probably never heard of "the Dead Sea," and the great majority of his readers cannot have done so. For Dr. Oman has apparently overlooked the fact that "the Dead Sea" is unknown in Scripture, and that the name does not seem to have come into use until the second century of our era, when it appears in Pausanias, Justin, and one or two other writers. The

name can hardly have been current when the Apocalypse was written, and is futile as an argument for establishing a connexion with the second vial and the empire of Sodom, unlikely enough in itself, in spite of the drastic method which has been adopted in order to make it good. The connexions established, in the case of the remaining vials and the respective empires, though not perhaps so glaringly improbable as the foregoing, and some more plausible than others, are on the whole shadowy enough ; but we cannot discuss them here.

One of the still unsolved riddles of the Apocalypse is that presented by the cryptic utterance of xiii. 18b. Though, perhaps, it must be admitted that an entirely adequate explanation of this hard saying is still a *desideratum*, suggestions have been made which afford something more than a hint as to lines along which the path to the solution lies.[1] It is with some interest therefore that the student will look to see what contribution so original a thinker as Dr. Oman has to make to the solution of this problem. On the score of originality, at least, he will not be disappointed.

" His number is six hundred and sixty and six "—time out of mind this item of information about the Beast, whatever it means, has been held by most of us as beyond question. It is therefore with some surprise that, on turning up this passage in Dr. Oman's translation, we read " the number of it is 1,000 + 60 + 200." How exactly this result has been achieved, after a serious effort to master the argument, we are still somewhat at a loss to say, and in our statement of it shall have recourse, for the more part, to Dr. Oman's own words. In common with many other expositors Dr. Oman is of opinion that " the name we have

[1] The writer may perhaps be permitted to refer to an article on this subject, "The Number of the Beast," which he contributed to the Expositor, Jan. 1921.

to work with is that of Cæsar. The "number of a man" suggests "with the pen of a man" (Isa. viii. 1), which is supposed to mean the present phonetic Hebrew characters. Therefore we are probably to interpret by Hebrew numerals! It is a little difficult to see why "number" should suggest "pen," and it is not easy to see how Isaiah viii. 1 supports that contention, still less how it leads to the conclusion that we ought to read the name in Hebrew letters. Assumption without proof contributes little of value to the solution of the problem with which we are concerned. "It is a number any person of penetration can understand, which would seem to mean that the key to it has already been given. But the only characteristic number hitherto found is the 1,260 years of the World-Empire." From this it is inferred—whether the inference is justified is a matter that might be argued—that the number intended is 1,260. It only remains therefore to show that "six hundred and sixty and six" means not 666 but 1,260. This Dr. Oman proceeds to do in the following terms: "'Cæsar' in Hebrew was written sometimes with three letters and sometimes with four. If we suppose either that the first letter (if there were only three) was raised by the same mark *as was used in Greek*[1] to multiply by ten or (if there were four) was multiplied by the second, the value of which is ten, its value is 1,000. The value of the second (or third if there were four) is 60, and of the last 200. And 1,000 + 60 + 200 is the number required." There is an air of mathematical exactness about this result, but how far the method by which it has been obtained will be found clear and convincing by the reader must be left to him to judge. The writer of this paper, however, is fain to confess that it has left him very much in the dark and quite unconvinced, save of the fact that it is gravely open to question on more than one point.

[1] The italics are mine.

If, for instance, we are to read the name in Hebrew letters, is it logical to ask us to have recourse to a Greek multiplication sign in determining their numerical value? Or again, on the supposition of there being four letters in the name, if we multiply the first letter by the second, why should we not continue the process, and multiply the result by the third letter, and so on? It is, however, impossible to enter further into detail at this point, though it may perhaps be remarked, in conclusion, that even if it can be established that 666=1260 the import of the Seer's message will remain an unsolved riddle still.

We have dealt with Principal Oman's book at considerable length, though not at greater length than its suggestiveness and importance demand; and, as it is, have by no means said all that might be said about it. The attitude taken in this paper has, in the main, been one of criticism. The author's method is one which the present writer cannot regard as either justifiable or safe in dealing with historical documents. Dr. Oman is far too ready to reject matter as spurious without any real evidence, solely on the ground of his own sense of the fitness of things, and on the same ground to exercise excessive freedom in changing contexts. But, criticism notwithstanding, it must be admitted that Dr. Oman has placed all serious students of the Apocalypse under great obligation to him by this notable contribution to the literature of the subject. Though one cannot but regard this remarkable essay, in its present form at least, as other than brilliant theory worked out with great learning and skill but resting upon a very uncertain foundation, some of the results attained are sufficiently striking as to suggest that further investigation along the lines opened up by Dr. Oman may ultimately lead to fruitful results. Such a radical revision and re-modelling of an ancient text can, however, only justify itself in so far as it is supported

by evidence of the very strongest and most compelling character. That such evidence is entirely to seek is the cardinal defect of Dr. Oman's book, and it is the purpose of this paper to point out that his brilliant superstructure rests upon a foundation which is inadequate to sustain it. That foundation requires to be re-made upon a sounder plan and with the aid of a less subjective method if the building is to stand foursquare, unshaken by the tempests of criticism that must inevitably beat upon it.

W. Ernest Beet.

THE TEN BEST BOOKS ON THE BOOK OF JOB.

The Book of Job has been compared with Lucretius' *De Natura Rerum* and the work of Omar Khayyám by no less an authority than Edward Fitzgerald himself. In reality it far transcends either of these two, great though they are. In all that entitles a book to a place in the front rank, Job is pre-eminent, and it may be doubted whether the world has ever seen or ever will see a single poem of comparable size and scope which can be placed on a level with it. From the merely external point of view its style is unsurpassed, for, magnificent as it appears in our English versions, it is still more beautiful and still more impressive in the original. Its subject is one of the great problems—perhaps the greatest of the problems—with which the human mind can grapple, and it is one of the earliest attempts to face and solve it. Possibly other writers may bring to their task minds more naturally adapted to metaphysics. The ancient Hebrew genius did not lend itself to philosophy, and yet we may well find that the more speculative intellects of the great Indo-European thinkers have brought us no nearer to a solution of the problems involved. For there is a luminous

intuition, a moral instinct, which carries with it more certainty and conviction than the subtlest logic. This is a property of all great poets, even of Lucretius, but none exhibits it in greater power and efficiency than the author of the Book of Job.

This book, moreover, stands out, not merely through the fineness of its texture and the magnitude of its theme, but also through other qualities. Its form is comparatively simple; omitting for the moment the explanatory introduction and the conclusion, it consists of a debate of three cycles, in each of which (so probably the original text had it) the friends all speak once, their speeches being always answered by Job, until, after a final appeal on his part, God appears to end the discussion. In this, it is true, there is nothing striking, but on the other hand what we may, for want of a better term, call the psychological structure of the book, bears the stamp of pure genius. Throughout the debate Job's friends represent thoughtless orthodoxy; Job is the sceptic who must find truth for himself. They, therefore, remain stagnant from beginning to end, and finish with the exact theory and outlook with which they started. Job, on the other hand, inevitably moves from one point to another, and though to his auditors his utterances seem blasphemous, he is in truth steadily working through his audacious language to a higher reverence. *Yet every step that Job takes has its starting-point in something that the friends have said.* His first speech is simply a cry of agony; the spiritual problem involved in his sufferings is only revealed to him when Eliphaz tells him that God is the Author of his troubles. Bildad warns him that it is futile for him to struggle against God, because God is always in the right, and at once the whole question of the "rightness," the "righteousness," of God is raised, to become the absorbing problem of the rest of the poem.

The absence of philosophical method has already been noted. Yet even this contributes to the truth of the picture as a whole. A man in Job's position cannot reason, he can do little more than feel; and the way in which he is tossed about from one thought to another, sometimes sinking to depths of despair and rising again to the heights of faith, is startlingly true to nature. Nowhere is a false note struck, nowhere is the presentation of the story of this man's soul spoilt by a psychological blunder. The historicity of "Job" has been called in question, and it is quite possible that he is a figure drawn from ancient folklore. But one thing is certain. The record of the spiritual struggles through which he passed, and the measure of victory which he won are not imaginary. The poet himself may not have been a wealthy *sheikh* suddenly reduced to beggary and physical rottenness, but he had himself thought what his hero thinks, battled as he battles, and worshipped as, in the end, Job worships.

It is sometimes said that all great literature must have two features; it must be born in revolt and it must be absolutely sincere. No book known to us better illustrates the saying than the Book of Job. It is the self-expression of a man who valued Truth above all else, and would be satisfied with nothing less. Because he found in the men about him, and even in the God whom men offered him, something less than truth, he would have none of them. Formulæ might be acceptable and comforting to others, but he must reach the first principles. Some sufferers might have been simply crushed by calamity, but it serves Job as a spur to rebellion. And it is not merely against man or against an established social order that he rebels, but against God Himself, as God was conceived in the poet's day. At the outset Job shares the theology and the outlook of his friends, and thinks of God as they do. But he feels

differently towards Him, and in the end his feeling triumphs over his thought. If God is what he had himself formerly believed and what the friends still believe Him to be, then he is prepared to challenge even God's claim to righteousness. He may be all-powerful, but He is not good, and Job is ready to confront him and to fling his challenge in the face of Omnipotence itself. In more modern language he almost says, "If this is true, you may possibly be God, but at the same time you are certainly the Devil." Yet there remains with him the conviction that God is after all good and righteous in the highest sense, and he wins one of the world's most notable spiritual triumphs when he appeals from God to God, from the God of theology to the God of reality.

It was inevitable that such a book should be a landmark in the history of religion. Unfortunately there is wide disagreement as to its exact importance. On the surface the closing verses of chapter xix. seem to suggest a hard-won belief in immortality which is a new element in Jewish faith. But the verses in question are obscure in meaning and corrupt in text, and some of the most distinguished of modern writers on the book find no real doctrine of a future life there. But even if that doctrine be held to have no place in the book itself, we have in Job an important link in the chain that led ultimately to the recognition of this truth. For it brings every reader face to face with the ultimate problem of the justice of God's dealings with men, and irresistibly leads to the conclusion that no solution is to be found as long as it is held that the whole drama must be played out upon the stage of earth. On any hypothesis Job is left in chapter xix. with the thought that after he is dead God Himself will vindicate Him and declare his righteousness. This may satisfy Job (and the present writer feels that he cannot accept this diminished view of

these verses as satisfactory), but it will not satisfy everyone, and there will in the end be those who are convinced that if the full enjoyment of Divine justice and Divine love is not to be attained on earth—as it seems it is not—then there must be some other life in which all deficiencies must be made good, and man may realize a friendship as enduring as God Himself.

It is not strange, then, that the available literature on the Book of Job, though not so large as that which deals with some other books, should reach a very high standard of excellence. The student who wishes for guidance has no lack of good material on which to work. It is perhaps the better for the wide differences of opinion on several important points, of which one has already been mentioned. A thorough study of the book itself is necessary if the reader would make up his mind and reach conclusions which shall be valid for himself. He will find no such general consensus of scholarship as will suggest that he can safely rely on the thinking of others, and take his opinions ready-made. Even the works recommended in these pages should be read with a critical eye, their premises examined and their conclusions tested.

Amongst the first needs of the student is a good translation. It is, of course, an impertinence to praise the Authorised Version, whose finest characteristics are nowhere better exemplified than in the Book of Job. And we are now fortunate enough to have the translation of Dr. Moffatt, a work with which even the expert Hebraist can hardly afford to dispense. For Dr. Moffatt, like every real translator, has given us not merely a rendering but an interpretation, and no one can safely neglect it. But as these are included in volumes which deal with the Bible as a whole, it will be better, having mentioned them, to pass on to others which are more nearly confined to the Book of Job. Of these two

important volumes have appeared in recent years. The first is that of Professor McFadyen, published in his *Wisdom Books in Modern Speech*. Dr. McFadyen appeals to many of us as our most successful modern translator of Hebrew poetry. His work on the Psalms and on such of the Prophets as he has published has been a revelation to many of his readers, and it is difficult to recommend his books too strongly to those who would appreciate the character of Old Testament poetry without learning Hebrew. He always treats his text with a judicious mixture of freedom and caution. He does not hesitate to adopt emendations when they are necessary to make good sense, but he avoids that tendency to rewrite his author which is the temptation of every textual critic of the Old Testament. His choice of words is as a rule singularly happy, and he has the gift of being able to keep close to his original text without sacrificing English idiom. Not the least of his virtues is his marked ability in preserving the very sound and rhythm of Hebrew verse. These qualities can be best illustrated by actual quotation, and we may select two of the most impressive passages in the book. The first of these is the picture drawn by Eliphaz of the ghostly visitant through whom revelation had come to him (Job iv. 12–21) :—

Now to me a word came stealing,
  And mine ear caught a whisper thereof,
In thoughts from the visions of night,
  When deep sleep falleth on men.
Fear came upon me and trembling,
  That made my bones all quake.
Then a breath passed over my face,
  The hair of my flesh bristled up.
There—it—stood;
  I could not tell what it looked like—
This form before mine eyes.
  In the silence I heard a voice say:
"Can mortal be just before God,
  Or a man clean before his Creator?

See ! He putteth no trust in His servants,
  His angels he chargeth with folly.
How much more those whose houses are clay,
  Whose very foundation is dust,
Who die before the moth,
  Crushed between morning and evening,
Bruised without any regarding it,
  Perished for evermore !
The cord of their tent is torn from them :
  They die—but without learning wisdom."

The other passage is Job's appeal to God in xvi. 15–22 :—

Sackcloth I sewed on my skin,
  And my horn I have laid in the dust.
My face is red with weeping,
  And over mine eyelids is darkness—
Though wrong there is none in my hands,
  And though my prayer be pure.

O earth ! cover not my blood :
  No rest let there be to my crying.
Behold, in heaven is my Witness,
  And I have a Sponsor on high.
My friends pour their scorn upon me,
  But my tear-stained eyes look unto God,
That he plead for a man with God,
  And for son of man with his Friend.
For when but a few years come,
  I shall go whence I shall not return.

There are possibly one or two lines in which the reader may feel that the rhythm is not perfect. But it recalls very strongly the Hebrew ; it has all the stateliness of the original, represents it almost word for word, and often keeps the exact order of the words. It would be difficult to find a more successful piece of translation, and when we remember that the style is sustained through a long book, we realize the greatness of Dr. McFadyen's achievement.

A more recent translation which must be mentioned is that of Principal A. H. Mumford, which has an introduction

by Dr. Peake. Mr. Mumford's aims and methods are quite different from those of Professor McFadyen, and there may be readers who will prefer them. He has used as his medium several familiar English metres, usually either anapæstic or iambic. In this respect he has followed the Hebrew language, which is so constructed that its metres invariably use rising rhythms. But the general effect is to produce an entirely different impression from that of the Hebrew text or of Dr. McFadyen's version. The lines are more regular, more rapid in movement, and, on the whole, less impressive. The prose prologue and epilogue are rendered into blank verse, and the rest of the poem is arranged in rhymed couplets. The general result is to lay a good deal of responsibility on the reader. Dr. McFadyen's rhythm is nearly fool-proof ; it is almost impossible to make his lines trivial or frivolous. Mr. Mumford's work, on the other hand, though it responds to sympathetic and dignified treatment, by no means necessitates it, and the effect could easily be spoilt by a careless or malicious reader. Another contrast between the two renderings is to be found in the much greater freedom that Mr. Mumford has taken with his text. This does not mean that he had indulged in unnecessary conjectural emendations, but he has allowed himself a wide latitude in paraphrase. It would often be difficult to recognize the text from this version alone, and the difficulty is increased by the absence of reference figures. The reader has to turn to an index to discover where each chapter begins, and even then he may be left in doubt about the limits of individual verses. Of course these difficulties do not often arise, but there are cases where they occur. As a fair illustration of the weakness and the strength of this version we may take the same passages as those selected from Dr. McFadyen, viz. iv. 12–21 and xvi. 15–22. The former runs as follows ;—

Now a thing was brought to mine ear and a secret whispered me,
when
Thoughts arise in the dreams of the night, when deep sleep falleth
on men,
Fear came upon me, I trembled, I shuddered, my bones shook
apace,
The hairs of my face bristled up and a breath passed over my face,
And IT stood still and I might not know the manner of thing that
I feared,
For a shapeless voice was before mine eyes and a silent voice I
heard :
" Before the Everlasting God shall mortal man be just,
Shall man be pure before the one that formed him from the dust ?
Behold He putteth not His trust in those that do His will ;
His Messengers, the Heavenly Host, are Sons of Folly still ;
How much more they who dwell in clay are feeble in His sight,
Who like the moth are crushed between the morning and the night !
Betwixt the daybreak and the dark they are destroyed and die,
They perish then and are no more and unregarded lie ;
Foredoomed to ignorance they come and without knowledge go,
Their cords are plucked, their tent is struck, they die or e'er they
know."

The other passage (xvi. 15–22) runs in four-line stanzas :—

My hands are hanging heavy, I scarce can draw my breath,
My face is foul with weeping, mine eyes are dim with death.
O Earth hide not my sorrow, let it lift up and cry,
Ye Heavens be my witness, and hear ye ones on high.

To God I lift my prayer, 'fore Him I lay my plea,
May God defend His creature, and God judge God for me,
O hearken, my Avenger, before the women come
To wail the soul departing to its eternal home.

We may leave on one side several attempts that have been made in recent years to dramatize the Book of Job. Whilst there is without doubt real dramatic force in the book, it does not lend itself easily to stage reproduction, for there is very little external action ; the drama is a spiritual one. It is true that they have occasionally been performed with success, especially in the work of the Adult Schools, but their value is rather in awakening interest in the book than in any original or illuminating interpretation that they

offer. Nor will the serious student need such a volume as Mr. H. G. Wells's *Undying Fire*. Though it is written with understanding and sincerity, it will appeal to the reader who is familiar with the original as one of the least successful of Mr. Wells's works, and at times it suggests a parody rather than a modern exposition.

Like all really great literature, the Book of Job needs commentaries for its full appreciation. Of these there has been no lack, either in England or on the Continent, and some of them may be included amongst the finest examples of Biblical exposition that we have. Many students will like to have at least one work in German to which they refer, and there are several which should be mentioned. That of Ewald (also available in English) is characteristic, and helps us to understand why its author dominated European thinking on the Old Testament (except on the subject of Pentateuchal criticism) throughout the greater part of the nineteenth century. Hitzig is brilliant but erratic. Dillmann, first published in 1869, reached its fourth edition in 1891. This is a most useful book, sound, scholarly and thorough, giving full value to the text, and often throwing light on difficult and obscure passages. Budde's commentary (in the *Handkommentar zum alten Testament* series) is not his best work, and, though useful and instructive, is hardly to be placed on the same level as his magnificent commentaries on Judges and Samuel. It is interesting to note that Budde is one of the few modern scholars who accept the originality of the Elihu speeches. But there is one commentary in German which far outshines all others. That is the work of Professor Duhm of Basel. Duhm has written well on other books, and in all that he has done his flair for textual emendation has been especially noticeable. But he is at his best when he is dealing with some great personality. It is just here that we find the

great difference between the ordinary good and learned scholar and the real genius. The former can tell us what verses may or must mean, may rightly divide the book with which he deals, and may show us how grammatical and lexicographical points may bring out his author's meaning. But the greater task is to take us into the secrets of a great soul, and present him to us as a real and living individual. It is here that Duhm's finest service has been done, especially in two books, the commentary on Jeremiah and the commentary on Job. Of the two the former is the less satisfactory for most readers, because Duhm holds strong views on the critical questions connected with Jeremiah, and leaves us comparatively little of the book as the Prophet's own work. Nevertheless, on the basis of what he accepts, he has offered an illumination which we could ill have spared. "Job" is free from even this weakness, and some of his readers would put this book in a class by itself, not merely amongst commentaries on Job, but amongst all commentaries yet written. Duhm may possibly be wrong in some of his interpretations ; it may be that none of the meanings he suggests for "skin for skin"—or any other obscure phrase—will be held to be right in the long run. It may be that even his textual criticism, brilliant as it is, may not command the assent of later scholars, but even those who find reason to differ from him in details will acknowledge that they have received from him an inspiration which they have failed to find elsewhere. For Duhm has lived with Job, seen life as he sees it, interpreted him from within. The remark which he makes about his author may not extravagantly be applied to himself—his work "is written with his own heart's blood."

Differences of opinion on the Book of Job have already been mentioned. These concern particularly two subjects, the higher criticism of the book and the interpretation of

the crucial passage at the end of chapter xix. The originality of the Divine speeches has also been challenged. Duhm holds that the prose portions are the remains of an old *Volksbuch*, a popular tale with a moral, which tried to show that though the righteous might be tempted by suffering, he would be justified and rewarded in the end. The poet has rejected the centre of this story, and has retained its beginning and end as the frame for his own work. Duhm holds the Elihu speeches to be a later insertion by an inferior mind, and also ascribes chapter xxviii. and some other passages to later hands. Chapter xix. 26 ff. he believes to indicate a real belief in a life beyond the grave, in which Job will see God and hold communion with Him. This may not be a universal law, Job has not thought the question through from this point of view, he is concerned primarily with his own relations with God, and the newly won faith is at least true for him. God is his friend. This is Duhm's position on the most important passage in the book.

Whilst no one else has ever written on Job with the same insight and power as Duhm, we are singularly fortunate in having a number of first-class works on the subject in English. The Book of Job is one of the three which have the greatest attraction for the real Old Testament scholar. (The other two are the Books of Hosea and Jeremiah.) Amongst the earlier works of that Scottish giant, A. B. Davidson, was a commentary on the Hebrew text of Job, of which, unfortunately, only one volume, containing chapters i.–xiv. was published. It is difficult to get, having been long out of print, and this fact together with the absence of a second volume make it difficult to recommend it in so small a list as ten. But it is agreed by all who have the opportunity and privilege of studying it that it takes a high place amongst studies of the Book of Job. Professor Davidson undertook the volume on Job in the *Cambridge*

Bible, and there are echoes of his earlier work to be heard there, but the peculiar fervour and illumination are less perceptible. Possibly he was hampered by having to deal purely with the English text.

That this last difficulty is not insuperable is clearly shewn by the work of Professor Peake in the *Century Bible*. For the reader who has had no theological training this is still far and away the best commentary yet published, and it can hold its own with more technical works in the reading of the more advanced student. One notable feature of this, as of all Dr. Peake's work, is the use that he makes of the thought and suggestions of his predecessors. Practically all that is of value for the interpretation of the book which has appeared in earlier works finds a place with him. He always acknowledges his debts, and is conspicuous for a modesty which seems to avoid pushing his own views forward unless he feels strongly that a satisfactory solution of a problem has never been suggested. It goes without saying that he has been largely influenced by Duhm, but his references to other writers are numerous and just. He agrees with Duhm in his view of the two crucial points mentioned, but with characteristic fairness states other views and offers the reasons why he considers them inadequate. Yet it would be a great mistake to suppose that Dr. Peake has simply made a collection of the opinions of other people. His volume has a unity and a standpoint of its own, and the author's clarity of thought and simplicity of expression makes it a book that anyone can read with pleasure and profit. If we had to select one book instead of ten, our choice would inevitably fall on this, for it is both an admirable introduction for the lay reader and a work which is indispensable for the trained student.

Since the publication of Professor Peake's book we have had no less than three commentaries of high value on the

Book of Job. The first in order of time is that of Professor Strahan. Like Dr. Peake's work this is intended primarily for the reader who knows little or no Hebrew, but that language is not rigorously excluded from the text, and the writer has been free to introduce Hebrew words where they were necessary for the full explanation of his meaning. His method is to print a chapter from the Revised Version, give a summary of it and then to add notes on the separate verses where they are needed. In some cases two chapters are taken together, and one of the few criticisms that can be passed on the book is that this principle has not been further extended, for occasionally a speech which covers two chapters suffers from being divided. But this is practically the only complaint that can be made, and it is a very small one. On the other hand the appreciation of the book and its message is very fine. Like every great commentator, Dr. Strahan has found his way into the heart of his writer and lays it bare before us. There is somewhat less reference to earlier writers in the text than there is in Peake, though the influence of their work—especially again that of Duhm —is clear. But like Dr. Peake, Professor Strahan has produced an independent work of great value and beauty. Nothing that can be explained is left without comment, and the longer notes expounding the positions taken by the various characters at different points in the progress of the book often illuminating. A feature of the book is the frequent reference to parallels in English literature, especially in English poetry. In general it may be said that whilst Professor Strahan is of the house and lineage of Duhm, he has given us a book of his own with which a serious student of the Book of Job cannot afford to dispense.

A book of a very different kind is that of the late Dr. C. J. Ball. It is the work of one who was not only a great Hebrew scholar himself and the teacher of some of our most

distinguished living Hebraists, but who in his later years made himself an expert Assyriologist, and carried his investigations in Comparative Philology down to the very roots of human speech. His commentary on Job, therefore, stands apart from all others. In the first place he gives in his introduction a full account of a Babylonian poem which, some have suggested, may have lain behind the story and indeed the poem of Job. A transliterated text is accompanied by a word-for-word translation. But Dr. Ball is not extravagant in his claims. He points out the differences between the two books, and indeed emphasizes them, while he goes no further in connecting them than to suggest that the Babylonian poem "may perhaps exhibit the germ" of the Hebrew. He spells the name of the hero of the book in Babylonian fashion, "Eyob" (adopted also by Dr. Moffatt), and the influence of his Mesopotamian studies is apparent throughout the whole. A fine original translation precedes the notes. These latter are mainly critical and philological, though at times there are illuminated exegetical comments. There can be no doubt that Dr. Ball has added materially to our knowledge of Hebrew, especially through his general comparative studies. In interpretation he shows himself as original as in philology, and entirely breaks away from the Duhm tradition, though he values and uses Duhm's work. His freshness and independence make his work extremely important for any student who would know what can be said about the book, and his textual work is often brilliant.

The *International Critical Commentary* on Job is the joint work of the late Professor Driver and of Dr. G. Buchanan Gray. It was the last piece of work undertaken by Canon Driver, and his death in 1914 found it barely half finished. He had done the greater part of the philological notes, twenty-six chapters of the translation and a few chapters of the

exegetical notes. The rest of the work is that of Dr. Gray, and in all parts there are additional notes from his pen, particularly those in the philological section dealing with the metre of the book. The Introduction is wholly his.

These facts in themselves are sufficient to commend it to every scholar, and no reader who knows the work of the two men will be disappointed. All that wide learning, free yet cautious criticism (Dr. Gray, like Dr. Ball, holds that the prologue and epilogue are by the author of the poem, and form an essential part of his book), and thorough appreciation of the subject can do, is summed up in this thick volume. We miss the passion of Duhm, but that loss is counterbalanced by the sobriety and solid basis of scholarship which are apparent on every page, whilst the more restrained language does not hide the fact that both writers were intensely conscious of the higher values of the book with which they were dealing. The philological notes form a book by themselves, and, but for the conditions under which the book was published would have occupied a separate volume. The translation is placed at the head of the page, and the exegetical notes beneath it. On all important points there are adequate discussions, and neither writer is afraid to leave a phrase or verse without having formed a final conclusion. Detailed comment on the book would be superfluous and impertinent, and it is enough to say that we have here a volume which for sheer weight of learning—though that is not its only claim to consideration —stands alone in the literature of the Book of Job, and possibly always will stand alone. It is intended, like all other volumes in the series, for the trained student, and for him it holds a unique position.

This does not, of course, exhaust the list of recent or even of good commentaries in English. There are, for instance, useful works by Watson in the *Expositor's Bible*, and by

Gibson in the *Westminster Commentaries*. Others that may be mentioned are the works of Bradley, Buttenwieser, Cox, Jastrow (these two are studies rather than commentaries), and Wright. But the student of the book will find that the five which have been selected will provide him with all that he will need for its appreciation and interpretation.

It goes without saying that such a book as this has attracted the attention of some of the greatest minds in the history of English literature. Apart from writers, such as Milton, who have made free use of the thought of the book, several leading authors have written monographs on the subject. Froude, for instance, included an essay on Job in his *Short Studies in Great Subjects*. Mark Rutherford devoted to it twenty-five pages of *The Deliverance*, and Blake's illustrations form a unique example of what may be done in interpretation by one who was both poet and artist. But there are several works by recognized Old Testament scholars which are in whole or in large part devoted to discussions of the book.

First amongst these may be mentioned Cheyne's *Job and Solomon*. This is an introduction to the "Wisdom" literature in general, and includes sketches of Proverbs, Ecclesiasticus and Ecclesiastes. In dealing with Job he begins with a sketch of the subject-matter, giving his interpretation of the positions taken by the various speakers, and discussing the critical and exegetical problems that arise. The second half of the study of the book is devoted to a consideration of different questions of a more general type, such as the date of the book and its relation to other documents.

It may be necessary to warn the reader that Cheyne's work fell into two very clearly marked periods. To many he is best known by his work in the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, when he was strongly under the influence of the Musri-

Jerachmeeel theory. It would be most unfair to judge his earlier work (*Job and Solomon* was published in 1887) on this basis. In this and other books belonging to this period we have the best results of his fine scholarship, and whilst he was certainly more advanced than any other leading British scholar of his time, it would be impossible to describe his work as extravagant. In many ways the reader will find his discussions illuminating and stimulating, though in a few places he was compelled to argue on points which are no longer living issues.

Another book in which a considerable section is devoted to the Book of Job is Peake's *Problem of Suffering in the Old Testament*. Naturally Dr. Peake covers a much wider field than this book alone, but, as in the case of Cheyne, it is extremely useful to have the subject placed in a definite setting. We gain not a little from seeing the place that it holds in the midst of other works which deal with similar subjects or with the same cycle of thought. And Dr. Peake shows us, not only what the book has to say to us in himself, but how it is related to its predecessors and successors, and how it contributed to the thinking of Israel on the most difficult problem with which theology has been confronted. Naturally the subject is treated from the definite point of view which the author has set before him, but he discusses it with clarity and completeness. Nothing that Dr. Peake has ever written is negligible, but in the opinion of many competent judges this is his best work. He has deliberately avoided covering the ground again in his commentary, and this renders the book doubly important. In a certain sense the two supplement one another, and should be read together by anyone who desires a fair view of the work of one of the ablest and most sympathetic interpreters of the Book of Job.

Two volumes must be mentioned which deal with the

Book of Job alone. The larger of these is Professor McFadyen's *Problem of Pain*, which appeared in the series which Dr. McFadyen himself edits under the title of *The Humanism of the Bible*. This is almost a commentary. The author takes each chapter and gives it in short sections, taken from his own translation, to which he adds a continuous explanatory comment. He is free in his criticisms of the poet and of his hero, and this adds materially to the value of his appreciation of the book as a whole. His exegesis is lucid and illuminating throughout, and in dealing with such passages as the close of chapter xvi. he rises to great heights, whilst his discussion of the difficulties involved in xix. 25 ff. and the possible interpretations is one of the most important contributions that have yet been made to the subject. A critical mind may fancy that Dr. McFadyen has read more into the book than its language strictly justifies, especially in his interpretation of the final scene in which God Himself appears. But this impression disappears when the whole volume is read, and it is seen to be a natural if not an inevitable development from what has gone before. We are grateful to Dr. McFadyen for his translation, but it must be admitted that our debt to him is very largely increased by his later exegetical work.

In 1916, when Great Britain was just beginning to understand what the War meant, the Student Christian Movement published a little book of about 70 pages called *The Cross of Job*. Its author was Principal (then Professor) H. Wheeler Robinson. He is known better to-day than he was nine years ago, and is recognized as one of a small group of men who are really contributing to the " dogmatic " theology of the twentieth century. But he combines in a unique degree the qualities of the metaphysical theologian and those of the Bible student. It is this double aspect of his mind which has rendered him so adequate an interpreter of the

Book of Job. He treats the book quite differently from any other scholar who has been mentioned. For one thing —to refer to a small detail—probably no one else would have thought of prefixing to the book a chart showing the "curve" of Job's emotional intensity, with its depths of despair and its heights of faith. His chapters are simple and short; they were originally delivered as a series of lectures to non-theological audiences. "The Problem as viewed by Job," "The Problem as viewed by his Friends," "The Problem as created and handled by Yahweh," "The Problem in Relation to the Christian Faith"—these are his four headings. Slight though such a scheme may appear to be, Mr. Robinson covers the whole ground, and fastens on the essential features of each side of the book as he discusses it. Some readers may disagree with his interpretation of crucial passages, but the Book of Job is a subject on which none but the ignorant will ever attempt to dogmatize, and the centre of interest must be less a man's opinions about the book than the use he makes of them. In this connexion it is the last chapter which will attract most attention, fine as the rest of the work is. "The Book of Job is . . . a first draft of the Gospel story"—that, with qualifications, is his thesis, and he leads up to it and maintains it with a charm and an impressiveness which are worthy of the subject. As a first introduction to the study of Job it would be difficult to find anything more suitable, and Mr. Robinson himself would probably agree that his purpose had been met if it led students on to the study of other and more extensive books of the kind that have already been mentioned.

Summing up, then, we may suggest the following list :—

A. Translation.

1. McFadyen (or Mumford).

B. Commentaries.

2. Duhm.
3. Peake.
4. Strahan.
5. Ball.
6. Driver and Gray.

C. General discussions.

7. Cheyne (*in Job and Solomon*).
8. Peake (in *The Problem of Suffering in the Old Testament*).
9. McFadyen, *The Problem of Pain.*
10. H. W. Robinson, *The Cross of Job.*

Every one of these is a first-class book, and each has its own contribution—and an important one—to make to the study of the Book of Job.

THEODORE H. ROBINSON.

NOTES AND NOTICES OF RECENT CRITICISM.

THE GROUPING OF GERMAN THEOLOGIANS.

A clerical correspondent writes to ask for information about Dr. Keller's sentence in the March number (p. 166): "It will be explained later why Schleiermacher and the later orthodox theologians and leaders of modern protestantism, Harnack, Tröltsch, Bousset and Wernle are omitted." He thinks that many unprofessional readers like himself would like to know more about such Continental groups. Professor H. R. Mackintosh, of the New College, Edinburgh, kindly supplies this answer:—

"Between Schleiermacher and Ritschl, whose greatest works in theology appeared respectively in 1821 and 1870–74, we may roughly distinguish three main groups. (1) The orthodox group, who made it their aim to expound a general scheme in accord with the Lutheran standards. Chief among them are Philippi,

von Hofmann, Thomasius, Frank, Ihmels. To some extent they were influenced by Schleiermacher, especially by his method of starting from subjective Christian experience and deciphering the nature of Divine realities from what goes on in the Christian soul.

(2) The speculative or philosophical group, who endeavoured to interpret and vindicate Christian belief by the principles of an autonomous reason. Biedermann and Pfleiderer did this (broadly speaking) from a Hegelian point of view, Lipsius from a Kantian.

(3) The mediating or eclectic group, who owed much to Schleiermacher, but also sought to bring philosophical insight to bear on the problems of doctrine. The most distinguished names here are Rothe and Dorner, Ullmann and Julius Müller. But in method Rothe approached now and then very close to Hegel.

Two supplementary groups may be noted. First, the Biblicist group, in many respects closely akin to group (1) above. Beck was the earliest great name ; others, who were at work well on into the twentieth century, are Cremer and Kähler.

With group (2) we may also associate the Tübingen school of New Testament criticism. It is unfair to say that they merely applied the Hegelian dialectic to history, but its influence told on their findings. Baur, the leader, gathered round him such men as Zeller, Schwegler, and, somewhat later, Hilgenfeld and Holsten.

From the time of Ritschl onwards, in addition to the great company of orthodox theologians (far more numerous than many foreign observers realize), two larger groups are discernible. First, the school of Ritschl, comprising such writers as Herrmann, Kaftan, Haering, Kattenbusch, Bornemann, Lobstein, Wendt, Loofs, Reischle, Kirn, Rade, Traub, and of course the great Church historian, Harnack. We must not think of these divines as repeating any shibboleth. They are all able and independent thinkers ; e.g. Loofs, " the most scientific of all German theologians," as Sanday called him, Haering combining Ritschlian elements with those of Pietism, Wendt with those of Liberalism.

There is, secondly, the school of Comparative Theology, led by Troeltsch. Troeltsch is the modern heir of Schleiermacher, with

a horizon widened by the later study of the great world-religions, and wrestling like his great predecessor with the problem whether Christianity is the absolute and final religion. Troeltsch a few years before his death in 1923 migrated from the theological faculty to that of philosophy, and it was always from the viewpoint of the philosophy of history that he inclined to study Christian faith. He was the systematic thinker of the new movement. Old and New Testament scholars who may be classed in sympathy with him are Gunkel, Bousset, J. Weiss, Eichhorn, Heitmüller, Weinel, Wrede, Gressmann, M. Dibelius, Schiele. But the presence of a scholar in this group is hardly a sure index of his strictly theological affinities."

H. R. Mackintosh.

"KNOW" IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Taking down, recently, from the not too numerous shelves of my library (for relaxation purposes, if for nothing else), Volume III of the *Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology* (Cambridge, 1857), from a set I am proud to possess because of its coming to me through the late Professor John Stuart Blackie, of Edinburgh University, I opened as by chance p. 116, where, in the course of a most exhaustive review of *Recent Editions of St. Paul's Epistles*, J. B. Lightfoot falls foul of A. P. Stanley's opinion that "there is no essential difference between *οἶδα* and *γινώσκω*"—the reference being to 1 Corinthians ii. 11.

Stating what his own view is, viz. that "they are still used with the same precision of meaning as in the Classical age," Lightfoot points out what the precise distinguishing factor is—"*οἶδα* is simple and absolute, *γινώσκω* is relative, involving more or less the idea of a *process of examination*." *I know* is the meaning of *οἶδα*: *I recognise* is the force of *γινώσκω*. His point of view is clear; and so is that of Wordsworth, which seems to coincide with it—*οἶδα*, *I know*; *γινώσκω*, *I perceive, I observe, I understand, I comprehend.*

Lightfoot, taking for granted, of course, that ordinary English readers should have full benefit of the distinctive shades of meaning discernible, proceeds to give illustrations of the same—which illustrations, with a view towards clearness, we may classify thus:—

(*a*) Direct Knowledge—*οἶδα*.

1 John ii. 20, *οἴδατε τὴν ἀλήθειαν*—A.V. and R.V., *ye know*.

1 John iii. 2, *οἴδαμεν ὅτι ἐὰν φανερωθῇ*, A.V. and R.V., *we know*.

1 John iii. 5, *οἴδατε ὅτι ἐκεῖνος ἐφανερώθη*, A.V. and R.V., *ye know*.

1 John v. 18, *οἴδαμεν ὅτι πᾶς ὁ γεγεννημένος*, A.V. and R.V., *we know*.

Similarly in v. 19, 20, and in other instances that are available.

(*b*) Indirect Knowledge—*γινώσκω*.

1 John iii. 1, *ὁ κόσμος οὐ γινώσκει ἡμᾶς*, A.V. and R.V., *knoweth us not*; but, surely, *understandeth* us not is better.

1 John iv. 6, *ἐκ τούτου γινώσκομεν τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας*, A.V. and R.V., *we know*: but *we discern* is what is intended.

(*c*) Direct and Indirect Knowledge Combined.

1 John ii. 29, *ἐὰν εἰδῆτε ὅτι δίκαιός ἐστιν, γινώσκετε*, A.V. and R.V. in both cases, *ye know*, whereas *ye come to know* seems what is required to bring out the sense of the latter word *γινώσκετε*.

John xxi. 17, *Κύριε, πάντα σὺ οἶδας, σὺ γινώσκεις*, A.V. and R.V., *thou knowest* for both words; but, suggestively enough, R.V. in margin reads *Thou perceivest*.

2 Cor. v. 16, *ἡμεῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν οὐδένα οἴδαμεν κατὰ σάρκα· εἰ καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν κατὰ σάρκα Χριστόν*, A.V. and R.V. *know . . . have known*; whereas, perhaps, *have regarded*, or *have understood* would better convey the sense of *ἐγνώκαμεν*.

The case we are considering is admirably stated by Westcott in his *Some Lessons of the Revised Version*, Hodder & Stoughton (1897), p. 101, "*εἰδέναι* describes, so to speak, a direct mental vision, knowledge which is, at once, immediate and complete; *γινώσκειν* a knowledge which moves from point to point, springing out of observation and experience." After putting it so, he gives convincing proof that to indicate the particular *shades* of meaning underlying the two words is of the very greatest importance, alike illuminative and informative to an ordinary reader—no *pedantry* in the matter but useful *service*. He illustrates and emphasises his position by the following references:—

John iii. 10, 11, *Art thou the teacher of Israel, and understandest* (Authorised Version, knowest) *not* these things? Verily, verily, I say unto thee, *we speak that we do know.*

John xiii. 7, What I do *thou knowest not now*, but *thou shalt understand* (A.V. *know*) hereafter.

John xvi. 19, *ἔγνω Ἰησους ὅτι ἤθελον αὐτὸν ἐρωτᾶν*—which Westcott thus dispose of:—a trait in His perfect humanity. Looking on the anxious faces of the disciples, He *perceived* (Authorised Version, *knew*) that they were desirous to ask Him.

In his *Pocket Lexicon* to the Greek New Testament (Oxford, 1916) Professor Souter clearly shows the distinction contended for in this Article. His way of putting it is—*οἶδα, I know* a fact. I know (*am acquainted with*) a person. *γινώσκω, I am taking in knowledge; come to know, learn*: Aor. *I ascertained, realised.*

This subject, interesting and important in 1857, is no less so, perhaps more so, in 1925. In what respect, and to what extent, the particularly distinctive meaning of the two words under review has been exhibited to English readers in some prominent Translations of the New Testament in modern times (our survey including only texts already quoted) may be best shown in tabular form as follows:—

Weymouth.	20th Century.	Moffatt.
1 Cor. ii. 11.		
"knows."	"knows."	"can understand."
"is acquainted with."	"comprehends."	"understands."
1 John ii. 20.		
"you know."	"you do know."	"you do know."
1 John v. 19, 20.		
"we know."	"we realise."	"we know."
1 John iii. 1.		
"does not recognise."	"does not know."	"does not recognise."
1 John iv. 6.		
"we can distinguish."	"we may know."	"we recognise."
1 John ii. 29.		
"since you know."	"knowing."	"as you know."
"be assured."	"you realise."	"be sure."
John xxi. 17.		
"you know."	"you know."	"you know."
"you can see."	"you can tell."	"you can see."
2 Cor. v. 16.		
"we know."	"we refuse to regard anyone."	"estimate no one."
"we have known."	"we once thought of."	"once estimated."

Weymouth.	20th Century.	Moffatt.
John iii. 10, 11.		
"and yet do you not understand."	"and yet do not understand this."	"you do not understand this?"
"we speak what we know.	"we speak of what we know."	"we do understand."
John xiii. 7.		
"for the present you do not know."	"you do not understand now."	"you do not understand just now."
"but afterwards you shall know."	"you will learn by and by."	"you will understand later on."
John xvi. 19.		
"we do not understand."	"we do not know."	"we do not understand."
"Jesus perceived."	"Jesus saw."	"Jesus knew."

P. Thomson.

DOES PHILIPPIANS III. 10–14 SUGGEST A METHOD IN PRAYER?

In the Expositor of June, 1918, pp. 425–436, there appeared an article of unusual interest entitled "A Forgotten Conception of Prayer." In the course of this article the author develops a number of profound ideas, e.g., "Prayer is education in and experience of redemption" (p. 432). This is quite in harmony with the Pauline doctrine of prayer, for it is only as we have "become united with Him in the likeness of His death" that "we shall be also in the likeness of His resurrection," and truly become partakers with Him who "ever liveth to make intercession."

Careful study of the author's exegesis of Philippians iii. 10 ff., however, reveals a number of points which are highly open to question, e.g.:

(1) Does *ἐπεκτεινόμενος* mean "stretching out" (p. 432)?

(2) Do the tropes from the races "make schism among Paul's figures of speech" (p. 433)?

(3) Are *ἐπεκτεινόμενος* and *συμμορφιζόμενος* "to be regarded as synonyms" (p. 433)?

That these questions are worthy of more than simply passing interest is evident from the fact that the author's exegesis of Philippians iii. 10 ff., which constitutes an essential part of his exposition, stands or falls as they are answered.

(1) Does *ἐπεκτεινόμενος* mean "stretching out"?

Here is a compound verb of a most interesting derivation and

of a consequent picturesque meaning. (It occurs in the New Testament only in this place.) *ἐπί*+*ἐκ*+*τείνω*. Thayer declares it to mean "to stretch out to or towards; Middle: to stretch (one's self) forward to; with the dative of thing indicating the direction." He cites Winer § 52, 4, 7 as his authority. Winer makes the figure still stronger by suggesting "Stretch out one's self after." In citing two examples of *ἐκτείνω* (Justin, *Trypho*, cxi. 1, and Barnabas xii. 2) as evidence for his point, viz.: that *ἐπεκτείνω* should be translated "stretch out" rather than "stretch toward," the author has blundered. He fails to appreciate the flavour which *ἐπί* gives to the verb. True it is *ἐκτείνω* meant to stretch forth one's hand, as a number of instances indicate: Matthew viii. 3, x. 13; Luke xxii. 53, etc. But *ἐπί* when compounded with verbs denotes "Motion, approach, direction *towards or to anything*" (Thayer, p. 236). It never suggests motion outward. Speaking specifically of this case, Ellicott says, "The *ἐπί* marks direction, *ἐκ* the posture in which the racer stretches out his body toward the objects before him."

Chrysostom said (Homily 12), "For he who stretches forward (*ὁ ἐπεκτεινόμενος*) is the one who though his feet are running endeavours to outstrip them with the rest of his body." A similar use of this verb is cited in Stephanus' Thesaurus, s.v. Strabo xvii., p. 800. Evidently, then, ancient as well as "Modern commentators from Olshausen onwards see in this verb the tense forward extension of the runner's body" (p. 432). Even the princely Bengel paraphrases this passage, "*Oculus manum, manus pedum, praevertit et trahit.*" (The eye outstrips and draws outward the hand, and the hand the foot.) These facts make the author's figure of "extended arms" in an act of tense worship not only inappropriate as a true interpretation of the passage, but entirely foreign to its spirit.

(2) Do the tropes from the races "make schism among St. Paul's figures of speech"?

Note them as they follow each other in the passage. Vincent suggests (International Critical Commentary, p. 109): "The metaphor of the race begins with ver. 13," *ἐπιλανθανόμενος* etc., suggesting the race already begun, and part of its course covered; *τοῖς δὲ ἔμπροσθεν*, introducing the verb quoted above, refers still more distinctly to the image of the racer. To use Chrysostom's language, they are the *δίαυλαι* which are yet to

be passed over in the Christian course. The *κατὰ σκοπὸν διώκω* continues the figure of the racer, "in the direction of the mark." *κατά* (Thayer II. 1c) denoting direction towards, as in Acts ii. 10, xxvii. 12, etc.; and *σκοπόν* suggesting the end of the course. (This word is used in the LXX. for the Hebrew מַטָּרָה, to denote the point at which the archer aims, Job xvi. 12, 13; Lam. iii. 12.) And finally the *εἰς τὸ βραβεῖον τῆς ἄνω κλήσεως* suggests the reward of the race—the prize of the heavenly calling. This survey of the figures in this passage shows it to be a unit, and the figure which unifies and blends its several parts is quite distinctly the race, and consequently no schism is made in the passage.

(3) Are *ἐπεκτεινόμενος* and *συμμορφιζόμενος* "to be regarded as synonyms"?

συμμορφιζόμενος is derived from the word *μορφή*, meaning "form"; a word which is used in Paul's great Christological passage, Philippians ii. 6, and denotes, as Spence suggests, "not a mere external resemblance (*σχῆμα*), but a deep, real, inner conformity," a great and entire change of *inner* life. This word and its derivatives may be found in such passages as Romans viii. 29, xii. 2; 2 Corinthians iii. 18; Galatians iv. 19. It is also found in Philippians iii. 21. It is quite plain that if there is any resemblance in *idea* suggested by these words it is with *σχῆμα* that *ἐπεκτεινόμενος* is synonymous, not with *μορφή*. With such a remote resemblance, if any, these words can hardly be regarded as synonyms, and the suggested interpretation of *συμμορφιζόμενος* is not sustained.

In the light of these three tests the author's exegesis collapses. Bengel's timely suggestion is appropriate here: "An expositor should be like the maker of a well, who puts no water into the source himself, but makes it his object to let the water flow without diversion, stoppage, or defilement."

The conception of prayer set forth in this suggestive article, although forgotten, may be true. With due respect to the author, our point is that this conception is not developed in Philippians iii. 10–14.

Howard T. Kuist.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

(*a*) " Pray tell me, that I may tell the girls in my Sunday-school class, why your translation of Job xlii. 14 makes Ringdove, Cassia, and Applescent, the names of Job's three daughters. The girls admitted that these names were prettier than Jemima, Kezia, and Keren-happuch, but one of the girls is called Jemima, and she was sorry to lose her name from the Bible, while the others were very anxious to know if your new names were true. I could not answer them, so I promised to write to you for information." (M. M. S., London.)

The Hebrew term *yemima* seems to be the same as the Arabic term for dove or wood-pigeon ; hence I render it Ringdove. But some scholars prefer to connect it with the Hebrew word for day (*yom*), and the Greek version actually translates it as Day ; this would imply that Job called the girl by a name which signified that he had now emerged into the daylight of health and prosperity. There is no dubiety, however, about Cassia, for Kezia (accent on the second syllable) is the name for this aromatic powder, ground from the bark of a tree, and popular in the ancient East for toilet purposes. Keren-happuch is the transliteration of a Hebrew expression, which is usually taken to mean " the horn (or, box) of antimony," i.e. of the paint used by women to brighten their eyes. Queen Jezebel used it, for example, as you can see in 2 Kings ix. 30. But for *keren-happukh* we may venture to read, with Professor Cheyne, *reah-tappuhim* or Applescent (Canticles vii. 9) ; some of Professor Cheyne's emendations of the Hebrew text were arbitrary, for he often re-wrote instead of restoring, but this is an easy and happy correction.

(*b*) " . . . One frequent criticism which I hear passed upon your translation is that it invents jingling sounds out of keeping with the Holy Scriptures. Our vicar is very angry at your rendering of Ecclesiastes vii. 6 : ' like nettles crackling under kettles is the cackle of a fool,' and insists that this is outrageous, to put in a jingling sound like this." (C. T. W., Yorkshire.)

I am afraid that he does not well to be angry. The " jingle," if you care to call it so, is in the Hebrew, which runs thus : *ki kekhol hassirim tahath hassir*. The writer deliberately chose a word for thorns or nettles (*hassirim*) which would chime with the

word for a pot or kettle (*sir*). The nearest equivalents of which I could think were "nettles" and "kettles." Unless you translate in some such way, you are missing what the Hebrew writer intended to say; if blame is to fall on anyone, let it fall upon the original, not upon a translator who knows that his business is to let the original speak for itself. I think this is not an unjust claim. The reply I now send to you will cover any of the charges about introducing "jingles," which some superficial readers have made. The chiming of words is there in the Hebrew, though our English translation generally obscures it. Why should it not be there? Milton said harder things about rhyme, about "the jingling sound of like endings," than, I suppose, any other English poet has ever said. But Milton's ear was too musical to ignore the occasional charm of chiming words, of assonance and of alliteration. Even in *Paradise Lost* he has admitted them:—

> "And of their doings great dislike declared,"

or

> "To respite his day-labour with repast
> Or with repose."

and elsewhere in the poems he uses what only the prosaic would call a jingle, as in the great lines,

> "Sleep'st by the fable of Bellerus old,
> Where the great vision of the guarded Mount
> Looks towards Namancos and Bayona's hold."

Hebrew poetry, on different levels, welcomed the chiming of words, for the sake of effect, though it did not know rhyme, and it is a part of our culture to appreciate such echoing syllables.[1]

[1] They are not confined to Hebrew or English. There is a parallel to the Hebrew proverb in Catullus (xciv. 2): "ipsa ollera olla legit."

REVIEWS.

The Four Gospels : A Study of Origins, treating of the Manuscript Tradition, Sources, Authorship, and Dates. By B. H. Streeter. Macmillan, 1924. Pp. xiv. + 622.

The volume before us is likely to prove an epoch-making contribution. It combines technical thoroughness and skill, mastery of detail, insight into historical and religious conditions, fertility of speculation, and a readableness enhanced here and there by brilliant and telling pithiness. Occasionally one waxes suspicious that some position advanced is almost too plausible to be true. But on any showing the book must still be held to register a very signal advance in Gospel-criticism.

It consists of four parts. The first of these, which deals with textual criticism, brings textual- and source-criticism into much closer relations with one another than has hitherto been usual. The modifications suggested in Westcott and Hort's theory are briefly these: the "Alexandrian Text" disappears as a phantom; the "Neutral Text" becomes the local text of Alexandria—the purest of local texts, but not nearly so infallible as Hort believed: the Koridethi MS. and its kindred are identified as giving the local text of Cæsarea: the "Western Text" should no longer be regarded as a unity—the Syriac versions represent the local text of Antioch, D a b etc. that of Italy and Gaul, k e W etc. that of Africa; the "Syrian Text" should be called "Byzantine." Dr. Streeter urges that a new apparatus criticus should be issued, printed below the *Byzantine* Text (to obviate enumeration of its countless supporters), and grouping the authorities by local families instead of following the present irrational system. Numerous emendations in the WH. Text are suggested in view of (*a*) this new grouping and the consequent balancing of the local texts, (*b*) the probability of frequent assimilation of the text of one Gospel to that of another, and (*c*) the attachment of a greater value than formerly to the longer as opposed to the shorter reading. Thus the words in Luke xxiv. 51, "and he was carried up into heaven," double-bracketed by WH., are treated as probably genuine, their omission in ℵ*D etc. being due to the apparent discrepancy with the chronology of Acts i. (pp. 130, 142 f.). The defence of the originality of the Western text of

Luke iii. 22, "this day have I begotten thee" (pp. 130, 143, 188), is less convincing, for this reading might well have originated with some scribe whose clear recollection of Psalm ii. 7 misled him. Incidentally, the date of Papias as given on p. 17 needs drastic revision in the direction suggested on p. 340; to suppose that Papias could have been writing in A.D. 165, when he had been previously collecting materials while two personal disciples of Jesus were still alive, seems unreasonable.

Part II. deals with the Synoptic Problem. Here Dr. Streeter substitutes "a four-document hypothesis" for the hitherto familiar "Two-Document Theory." His four documents are: (1) Mark; (2) Q, an Antiochene collection of sayings, "with very little attempt at arrangement" (possibly the work of the Apostle Matthew); (3) L, material collected by Luke at Cæsarea about A.D. 56; and (4) M, a Jerusalem-collection of traditions, reflecting the Judaistic reaction against Paulinism. One advantage of the theory is that we no longer feel constrained to ascribe to a single source (Q) passages, such as the Lord's Prayer, which are absent from Mark and *only approximately* parallel in "Matthew" and Luke. The various sources occasionally overlapped. Luke usually preferred Q; "Matthew" usually conflated his sources. The use of M is responsible for the strongly anti-Gentile features in "Matthew." Contrary to Dr. Streeter's earlier view, he does not now believe that Mark used Q. He restates the theory he advanced in *The Hibbert Journal* for October 1921, as to the composition of Luke's Gospel. Luke's first Gospel was put together from Q and L, and had no Infancy-narratives. Later Luke came across a copy of Mark (probably mutilated, lacking vi. 45–viii. 26); he inserted sections of this at intervals in his earlier Gospel, prefixed Luke i. and ii., and thus produced the Gospel in the form in which we now have it. On the whole the case is well made out; but one or two points on the general problem suggest comment. The argument for the priority of Mark (pp. 157 ff.) occasionally uses language (e.g. about the others "reproducing" him) which seems to assume in advance the very point to be proved. The argument on pp. 164–168 is not very clear and hardly does justice to "Matthew's" frequent departures from Mark's order. In Luke iii. 3 and parallels, Dr. Streeter thinks "Matthew" represents Q, while Luke is following Mark in speaking of *βάπτισμα μετανοίας εἰς ἄφεσιν*

ἁμαρτιῶν; but "Matthew's" omission of these words is probably due to doctrinal reasons, rather than to their absence from Q. The suggestion that the Fourth Gospel is dependent on the *oral* tradition, at Ephesus, of Mark's (now lost) Resurrection-story, is quite a probable one: not so the alternative view that an unmutilated copy of Mark got to Ephesus, but somehow never survived (p. 352 f.).

Part III. deals with the Fourth Gospel. Dr. Streeter's position briefly is that the Apostle John was martyred in Palestine, that John the Elder may as a boy have seen the crucifixion, and that he was the author of the Fourth Gospel and all three Epistles. The Beloved Disciple is the Apostle John idealised; the narratives are generally reliable; the discourses are mystical and prophetic interpretations of Jesus' teaching, believed to be imparted by the Risen Lord Himself; the chronology is the only one we possess, and represents the best information the Elder could collect. The Apocalypse is the work of John the Seer—quite another person. Space does not permit us to embark on a criticism of this reconstruction; but it swarms with difficulties. It involves disbelieving both of our earliest informants about Johannine authorship, viz. the writers of John xxi. 24, and Justin. It accepts the very poorly attested early martyrdom of John the Apostle. It ignores the differences in theological standpoint between Gospel and First Epistle (p. 458) and the signs of composite authorship in the Gospel itself (p. 377 f.). It presupposes the presence of two highly eminent Johns in and about Ephesus at the same period. It takes it for granted that the famous extract from Papias' preface *must* specify two distinct Johns, and *cannot* be referring firstly to the past, and next to the present, sayings of the same John (pp. 434, 443, 448, 450). But the problem is much too big to be pursued further here.

Part IV. gives a most useful and brilliant summary of the author's views as to the date and provenance of the Synoptic Gospels—Mark written in Rome between A.D. 64 and 70; "Matthew" in Antioch about A.D. 85 (representing a "Petrine compromise" between the liberal and Judaistic parties); Luke in Achaia about A.D. 80. Some suggestive observations are also advanced in regard to the origin and purpose of Acts.

The book contains a number of slips, and I note them for the convenience of readers, and also in view of the future editions

which will certainly be wanted. Luke xxii. 43 f. appears as Luke xxi. 43 f. on pp. 61 and 123, and as Luke xxiii. 43 f. on pp. 129 and 137; p. 83, first line under the headings, read τουτου for τουτον; p. 124 (towards the bottom), transpose "the Revised Version" and "Westcott and Hort"; p. 170, l. 23, for Lk. xiv. 15 read Lk. xi. 15; p. 173, l. 4 from bottom, transpose the references; p. 174, l. 14, read Mk. viii. 22–26 (which speaks of a *blind* man) for Mk. vii. 32–34 (deaf stammerer); p. 176, l. 17, insert καὶ ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ before ἐπηρώτα (see l. 5 from bottom of text of page); p. 196, l. 3, ix. 38–41 should read ix. 38–40, and ix. 41 should be added to the list in paragraph (*c*) immediately below, and some adjustment in the counting of verses will be necessitated by the change; on the same page, note 1, for Mk. xiii. 4 read Mk. iv. 23; p. 216, l. 6 from bottom, 34a means the whole of 34 except the last three words; p. 222, l. 2 of "Additional Note," the insertion of iv. 14–15 after iii. 1–iv. 30 is redundant; p. 251, ll. 2, 3 from bottom, the "Q Beatitude" does not terminate in the way stated; p. 254, l. 5 from bottom, Mt. x. 36–38 should apparently be Mt. x. 26–38 (? or 39); p. 255, l. 4 from bottom, Q should apparently be M; p. 259, l. 3, read 18 for 17; p. 263, l. 12, 36–39 should apparently be 26–39; p. 278, ll. 10 f., xii. 10 should apparently be xii. 12 (cf. p. 280, near bottom); p. 291, l. 3 of "The Reconstructed Q," Lk. iii. 2 should rather be Lk. iii. 2b, and two lines lower, xii. 1a should be xii. 1b; p. 312, in the Lucan passage (vi. 4) in the second table, μόνους, not ἱερεῖς, should be underlined; p. 319, in the Lucan passage (xx. 3) in the first table, εἶπατέ should be underlined; p. 375, is not the mention of Neoplatonism somewhat of an anachronism?; p. 414, l. 11, transpose ἀνάβας and ἀνὰ μέσον; p. 421, the statement in ll. 9 f. needs amendment—John v. and vi. do not mention *two* visits to Jerusalem, for vi. mentions the *time* of the feast, but no visit; p. 157, "pedisequus" is spelt "pedesequus"; p. 424, "Peraea" is spelt "Peroea"; on p. 329, l. 4, there is a slip in the punctuation, and on p. 585, l. 12, one in the grammar (read "show" for "shows").

This seems an extensive list; but most of the items are such as can easily be detected, and in regard to others one would prefer to have the author's concurrence before correcting them. The book is an easy one to use. Besides being furnished with useful appendices and indices, it provides a full summary before

each chapter ; and the admirable tables on pp. 108 and 150 put the reader in quick possession of Dr. Streeter's views. We are deeply indebted to him for a work so interesting and valuable.

C. J. Cadoux.

* * * * *

Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums und des römischen Katholizismus. By Carl Mirbt, 4th edition (enlarged). Tübingen, Mohr, 1924. Price G.M. 12.50.

It is now almost thirty years since the first edition of the notable Source-book appeared. Then it contained 155 separate illustrative extracts in 288 pages. Now it has grown to 802 extracts in 650, and the pages themselves are much larger. The method remains unchanged. Each extract is prefaced by a note indicating the best available printed text of the whole document, and enumerating the most important contributions to the interpretation and elucidation of its contents which have appeared either in books or in periodicals. This valuable feature has been greatly developed. One instance may be selected as typical. In regard to the Canons of the Council of Sardica, reference was made in 1895 to four discussions, in this new edition to twenty-two, including only two of the original four.

This edition, further, covers a larger field than any of the earlier ones. It is no longer concerned exclusively with the growth and development of the institution ; it provides the essential material for an evaluation of the forms which the religious life has taken within the institution. It has now a range which enables it to be an efficient guide in all the questions raised by a book like Heiler's *Der Katholizismus*.

Students interested in the history of the Papacy have, for almost a generation, felt Mirbt to be indispensable. His work has now reached a pitch of perfection which makes it a model of what a Source-book ought to be. One defect, however, which was evident in the first edition, has not been eliminated. Mirbt's knowledge of the relevant English discussions is fragmentary. In the list, already mentioned, of the discussions of the Council of Sardica, of the whole twenty-two only one is English. In view of the difficulties in the way of procuring modern English books in Germany we do not wonder at some of the omissions. But surely the University Library of Göttingen possesses a copy of the *ERE*.

Hugh Watt.

Pistis Sophia, literally translated from the Coptic by George Horner, with an introduction by F. Legge, F.S.A. London: S.P.C.K., 1924. Pp. xlviii, 205. 16*s*. net.

The miscellany known as Pistis Sophia—the deposit of some school of Egyptian Gnosticism—has a somewhat remarkable history. The solitary Coptic text, acquired before 1785 by the British Museum, was bought from a collector who, it appears, left no record as to how he had acquired it or where it had come to light. For over sixty years it lay almost unregarded until in 1851 Petermann edited a translation into Latin prepared by the German scholar, Schwartze. Since that date, it has been the subject of much discussion, and has been translated into many languages. The volume before us contains the second English translation, the first being by G. R. S. Mead in 1896. The first question, then, is "Is this new translation necessary?" It is quite evident from the Preface that what we have before us in this edition is only two-thirds of the book as planned by Mr. Legge. The first part is an introduction, the second part is a literal translation from the Coptic by Mr. Horner, the third part, which Mr. Legge did not live to complete, was to have been an explanatory revision of this literal translation. Only one tiny fragment is incorporated of this projected third part, in a note on p. 121. So what we actually have before us in the way of text is a careful literal version of the Coptic. Here is a sample of it, taken almost haphazard from the first of its constituent documents. It is part of the episode of Jesus changing and confusing the motions of the heavenly bodies which might well be an excerpt from a Gnostic sermon on Isaiah xliv. 25, "It happened therefore, they having known these (things) in the time, and whenever became the number of the ticket, of Melkhisedek, the Receiver was wont to come out also and go in unto the midst of the Rulers of all the Aeons, and unto the midst of all the Rulers of the Destiny, with those of the Sphere, and he is wont to disturb them and cause them to put away indeed their cycles quickly, and then they are wont to be distressed, and sow the power outside of them, out of the breath of their mouth and out of the tears of their eyes, and out of the sweat of their bodies" (pp. 18–19). Here is another sample from the fifth document—from that enunciation of astrological fatalism which is so completely at issue with the

thought of the first—" Said Jesus to his disciples, If should the Sphere turn round and (if) Kronos with Ares should come behind the Virgin of the Light; and Zeus with the Aphrodite should come in the presence of the Virgin, being in their own Aeons, they are wont to draw (away) the veils of the Virgin; she is wont to become cheerful in that hour, seeing these two stars of light in her presence. And every soul which she will cast unto the cycle of the Aeons of the Sphere at that hour, for them to come out unto the world, they are wont to become righteous and good, and they are wont to find the mysteries of the Light at this time. (Or if not) she is wont to dispatch them another time, that they may find the mysteries of the Light. If Ares also with Kronos should come to the presence of the Virgin, Zeus with the Aphrodite being behind her, not seeing them, every soul which she will cast unto the creatures of the Sphere at that hour, they are wont to become evil and wrathful, and they are not wont to find the mysteries of the Light " (pp. 198–9). These samples certainly suggest that this literal translation is a mistaken effort, that it has rendered a confused and confusing book still more enigmatic. But as we read page after page, it begins to make a sharp and definite impression, and the very repetitions, inversions, and unfamiliar turns of expression which seem to obscure the details, tend to clarify what there is of meaning in the mass. Mr. Mead's, which is a translation of a translation and runs fluently, fails to convey the impression of men grappling with ideas beyond their range. For the student whose acquaintance with Coptic is either slight or wanting, this literal version of Mr. Horner's is the safest guide. It might, however, have been furnished with notes and cross-references after the manner of the select treasury of notes which Moffatt has appended to his summary of contents in *ERE* (vol. x, pp. 46–7).

Turning to the introduction, we note that Mr. Legge has here elaborated views which he had already outlined in previous publications. He regards the work as belonging to an Egyptian Gnostic sect which reckoned itself true to the traditions of Valentinus; the first two of its five main documents emanated from Valentinus himself, and priority can therefore be claimed for them. He thus dissociates himself from the view of Schmidt that the fourth document is the oldest in the collection and, as it were, the root of the other three, and dismisses the subse-

quent emendations of that theory by Liechtenhan and Preuschen. But, he contends, the book was not put together by the sect for its own use; it lacks entirely the regular Coptic formulæ. Nor was it compiled by some ecclesiastical champion of orthodoxy who, having chanced upon the documents, resolved to expose the erroneous doctrines of those misguided Gnostics. Had this been its origin, it would have been weighted with a running commentary of refutations. The MS. indicates "that it was begun by a scribe who took unusual pains to ensure an accurate copy, and that when he handed over for a time the continuation of his work to a subordinate, he yet went over and corrected the latter's work with as much care as he bestowed upon his own. All this suggests that it was made for official or judicial use; and the most reasonable guess is that it was the draft or copy of a legal document made for the enlightenment of some conciliar, episcopal, or even secular tribunal concerned in the suppression of heresy, such as the Inquisitors of the Faith set up by Theodosius" (p. xxx.). Since Woide had dated the MS. as belonging at latest to the fourth century, Legge assigns the compilation of this document to the time of early Imperial action against Christian heretical sects. But scholars of equal standing with Woide have dated the MS., on purely palæographical grounds, as late as the tenth century. So, accepting the purpose of the document as Legge states it, may not the particular emergency which led to its production have been much later? May it not have been the peril of the Mohammedan conquest? It seems as if the programme of Islam as promulgated in the Koran contemplated a certain measure of toleration for the Sabians on the ground of their monotheism, and because they, like Jews and Christians, possessed a sacred book (the book of Elkesäi). Might it not well be that a group of Gnostics in upper Egypt, aware of this exceptional treatment and its grounds, claimed a similar exemption, and, in support of their claim, hurriedly produced this excerpt of the writings treasured in their midst?

Besides this attractive theory of a judicial origin the introduction contains much valuable material. Its analysis of the various documents and their governing conceptions shows ease and mastery. I cannot agree, however, that the first two documents are the work of Valentinus himself. The arguments by

which this position is supported, e.g. the attempt to demonstrate from Tertullian's writings in general and his account of the Valentinians in particular that he must have known these documents, are singularly unconvincing. The five parallels cited are so weak that in comparison the case (which Legge dismisses) for the first document using the fourth Gospel is strong indeed.

In spite of the skill and scholarship manifest in the introduction, there are not a few marks of haste. There are, e.g., no fewer than three independent explanations given of the order in which the constituent parts have been placed in our document: "This arrangement follows strictly the rule of stichometry observed by writers of the period which prescribes that the longest document shall come first" (p. xv). "I have no hesitation in deciding that in this the scribes followed the usual practice in legal matters and that the earliest document is that which comes first in the MS." (p. xxxii). "It is also probable that anyone making extracts for judicial use from the books of a sect would begin with the most informative" (p. xxxii). This is a trifle too reminiscent of Codd's duck and the seven separate defences of that ingenious barrister, for considered historical writing. Among other marks of haste may be mentioned these two: on p. xvii, in the summary of the first document, the number of the Penitences of Pistis Sophia is variously given as twelve and ten, while in the text (p. 54) the hymn of the thirteenth Penitence is recorded; and on p. vii. the MS. is said to have been bought in 1785, and on p. ix to have remained unnoticed in the Museum till 1778. Other manifest slips are "alternative" for "alternating" (p. viii), "two first" for "first two" (p. xv), "Forerunner" for "Forerunners" (p. xx), "al" for "all" (p. 10), "Moffat" for "Moffatt" (p. xiv), "Lichtenhau" for "Liechtenhan" (p. xiii) and "Maththaios" on p. 201 with reference to p. 80 which has "Mathaios."

A limited number of mistakes of this kind ought not, however, to blind us to the great value of this volume. A useful enterprise has been carried through with considerable success. The publishers have done their part well. And as Pistis Sophia is one of the few authentic remains from which we gather inside information as to the teaching of any branch of Gnosticism, it is all to the good that we have fresh materials for judgment furnished us in such an attractive form. We see more clearly

how those Gnostics who were not won over to the main stream of Christianity by the mediating influence of Clement of Alexandria and his successors gradually departed further from what remained in their system of Christian faith by assimilation of the Pagan tradition and by incorporating sundry elements, mainly magical and pseudo-mystical, from their environment until, in the fifth document of this late collection, it is exceedingly hard to find anything which has even the semblance of Christianity except the name Jesus.

HUGH WATT.

CURRENT LITERATURE.

PROFESSOR A. C. BAIRD has written a small book upon *The Acts of the Apostles* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1*s.*) for a series called "Primers for Teachers and Bible Class Students." This is a Scottish Church Series which ought to be better known than it is in the South; it has some remarkably good volumes, particularly on the Old Testament, and those who are interested in religious education should consult the list of volumes already issued. Those by Professor C. A. Scott, Professor McFadyen, Professor A. R. Gordon, Dr. Skinner, and the late Professor A. B. Davidson, for example, are masterpieces of compressed, intelligent scholarship, put at the service of the ordinary reader. Professor Baird's sensible and lucid volume treats Acts as a great unfinished work by Luke, brings out its historicity, its object, and its plan, and offers a careful survey of its contents. He thinks that while Luke originally meant to write about all the apostles, he changed his mind as he proceeded with his task. "It looks as if the historian had found the task too big to be handled in one volume." Hence he concentrates, in the second part, upon the activities of the Apostle Paul. The book is well planned, and ought to meet the needs of those for whom it is designed.

* * * * *

Jesus of Nazareth (Madras: Authors' Press and Publishing House, 1*s.* 6*d.*) is a selection and arrangement of material, mainly from the Synoptic Gospels, prepared by Francis Kingsbury, "Sometime Army Chaplain to His Britannic Majesty's Forces

in Iraq," in order to provide a record of what is well-attested in the gospel-story " from the standpoint of liberal Christianity." The text is generally printed from the English version. It opens with the baptism of Jesus, omits the nature-miracles, and closes with the burial, to which the words of 1 Corinthians xv. 4–8 are appended. The main Johannine data included are some sentences from the fourth chapter and the story of the woman taken in adultery. The omission of the transfiguration-story leaves the subsequent movements of Jesus rather in the air, however, and the wholesale rejection of a Perean ministry is not convincing. But no one who has tried to construct a chronological synthesis will fail to sympathize with Mr. Kingsbury over the difficulties of the task, and every one will share his hope that " this book will help ordinary readers to know the truth as it is in Jesus." It is an honest and earnest effort. The dedication is significant, " To Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi, who by his life, character, and sufferings, has made Jesus of Nazareth a reality to the people of India, and to the nations of the world."

* * * * *

The educational function of Broadcasting is shown in " The Broadcast Library " which Mr. J. C. W. Reith is editing (Hodder and Stoughton). Two volumes have appeared, one by " Philemon " on *From my Windows* (3*s.* 6*d.*), and one by Mr. Kay Robinson on *At Home with Nature* (3*s.* 6*d.*). The latter book is written with a simplicity and a skill to which we are accustomed in Mr. Robinson's work ; anyone who reads these pages will understand birds and beasts better, and the lessons can be learned with pleasure. It is a delightful series of sketches. " Philemon's " range includes human nature ; he offers a view of life, which is varied, but it is the view of a man who has seen things with his own eyes and who interprets them from within. " I may see something," he says, " which you may have missed. I may see a way where you only see an obstacle." He often does. His book is a charming, unassuming set of observations, with a religious outlook which is never forced. Many readers, whether they have listened to such talks by Mr. Robinson and " Philemon," or whether they now hear them for the first time in print, will welcome this open-eyed presentation of things seen and unseen.

We have to acknowledge receipt of the *Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies* (*London Institution*), published at the price of six shillings. This is the second part of Vol. III (1924), containing articles and reviews. Among the papers there is a study of Semitic Kinship by Brenda Z. Seligman, which criticizes Sir J. G. Frazer's theory of cousin-marriages and also some of Robertson Smith's opinions in *Kinship and Marriage*. Professor Rhys Davids, in a vivacious review of the Russian scholar Stcherbatzky's paper on Buddhism, insists that in original Buddhism the decisive term "dhammā" means "things," not "ideas" or "states of mind." Mr. H. H. Dodwell, reviewing the fourth volume of the "Cambridge Mediæval History," suggests that the pro-Byzantines, like Professor Bury, are in danger of going too far. "For all their tactical ingenuity the Byzantines failed to defend Syria, they failed to defend their European provinces, they lost Constantinople first to the rude dulness of a Crusading attack, and then to the equally rude dulness of a Turkish siege. In short, the old judgment of their degenerate cleverness must stand."

* * * * *

Dr. Hensley Henson has always the courage of his opinions, and his episcopal charge of last November, *Quo Tendimus?* (Hodder and Stoughton, 2*s*. 6*d*.) contains two outspoken criticisms of the Enabling Act and of "Copec." The volume, however, covers a wider survey of the religious situation, and its trenchant pages possess an interest for those who are not members of the Anglican Church. He speaks severely of the practice of reserving the Sacrament for purposes of worship, a devotional habit which he declares to be disloyal to the Church of England. It is curious to find that he objects to evening Communion, not on any doctrinal ground, but for reasons of spiritual expediency or edification, because the air of the Church is bad, the clergyman is tired, and the communicants are eager to get home. This sounds strange, for evening Communion may be celebrated with perfect reverence, as many of us know. However, the Bishop says frankly that he would be glad to see it ceasing. "That it is not really necessary may perhaps be inferred from the fact that it is a comparatively recent innovation in the Church of England, and is everywhere tending to disappear."

In the diocese of Durham, apparently, only 39 out of 266 parishes celebrate evening Communion.

* * * * *

To the fourth series of "The Scholar as Preacher" the Rev. A. J. Gossip contributes a volume of twenty-three sermons called *From the Edge of the Crowd* (T. and T. Clark, 7*s.*), the sub-title being "Musings of a Pagan Mind on Jesus Christ." The sub-title is pleasantly ironical, and will mislead nobody. Mr. Gossip is no outsider, for all his protestations; he shows in these sermons a rare insight into the vital issues of Christianity, and he writes with verve. These are real sermons, not sermons camouflaged as essays. You hear the preacher in these pages. They convey something of the urgency and passion and direct impact with which the messages were originally delivered. Mr. Gossip is more interested in life than in theology, and his ample illustrations are not academic by any means, though he can draw upon his knowledge of Buddhism here and there. What he has given us in this volume is a series of sermons which palpitate with vitality. And the vitality of a cultured mind is one of the most attractive gifts in the pulpit.

* * * * *

In "The Library of Philosophy and Religion" (Hodder and Stoughton), three new volumes appear, Professor R. F. A. Hoernle's *Idealism as a Philosophical Doctrine* (5*s.*), Dr. John S. Griffiths' *Health and Personality* (6*s.*), and Professor D. Miall Edwards' *The Philosophy of Religion* (6*s.*). The series is intended to meet the needs of the average person, who is interested without being technically equipped. Professor Hoernle, who dedicates his book to the memory of Bernard Bosanquet, deliberately sets himself to catch such readers, and succeeds. He expounds idealism, in the light of recent attacks upon it, but wisely he does not do too much. All I provide the reader with, he confesses, "is the appetizer; he must get the dinner for himself." This book shows him, at any rate, where the best dinner is provided. It cannot have been easy to write a handbook on the subject within such limits, especially a handbook which is original. Yet this is what Professor Hoernle has managed to do. Professor Edwards' book has a special appendix on Otto's *Das Heilige*, and, like Professor Hoernle's, a useful bibliography. One of the best chapters is that dealing with anthropology,

though the height of the argument is reached in the discussion of religion and reality. Professor Edwards writes with singular attractiveness. He has the faculty of putting his case well, and, even on so threadbare a topic, he continues to be not only comprehensive but alluring. Dr. Griffiths follows the human personality in its development from birth to old age, making many good points in a fresh style. He stresses, for example, the need of discipline in childhood. "Unless the rhythm of regularity, punctuality and docility to command is impressed upon the child, it may lose its salvation in after-days." Indeed the whole book is alive with a keen sense of the ethical and mental value derived from physical soundness. It is a pleasure to read Dr. Griffiths' pages for their brisk diagnosis of life. He deals in no mere generalities. Subjects like teaching, sex and holidays, for instance, are handled with incisive counsel. There are not many books written along this line, and we count Dr. Griffiths' contribution one of the most serviceable.

* * * * *

Dr. R. H. Charles has published a study of *Gambling and Betting* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1*s.* 6*d.*), which deserves to be read and used by all who may be interested in the effort to check these plagues of modern civilization. Not that they are by any means modern. Dr. Charles shows how at an early age gaming was popular, in Egypt, India and Crete, for example, nearly two thousand years before the Christian era. Still, it has become ramified to-day to a bewildering extent. There are well-known difficulties about handling the subject, for on one side the practice becomes more or less innocuous. Dr. Charles puts the case against it trenchantly but fairly. He defines gambling as an appeal to chance, due to man's inherent love of adventure or sport, or to the desire for acquiring property, and carefully explains, for example, how insurance, which is technically a form of gambling on the future, is legitimate. He wishes prohibitive legislation. But he also shows how the vice is irreligious as well as anti-social. This is a small book, and it is cheap; its pages contain some valuable counsel on a matter which requires straight thinking as well as straight talking, and we commend it warmly to those who realize the menace with which it deals.

CURRENT ISSUES.

It was Renan who once said that Matthew's Gospel was the most important book in the world. Professor J. A. Findlay goes further; he claims that it is the loveliest book in the world. This is why he has written a volume on *Jesus in the First Gospel*, a charming study of Matthew's Gospel, which combines criticism and spiritual appreciation.

* * * * *

When he comes to the well-known passage in the eighteenth chapter about binding and loosing, he makes a daring suggestion. The ordinary form of the text is: "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven." Most people take this to refer to the Church's power of excommunication or of prohibitory decisions. But Professor Findlay prefers to follow the Western text, which reads: "Whatever you shall bind on earth shall be loosed in heaven." It is a reading, he says, "which I frankly confess may be explained simply as a mistake; but some slips are inspired, and, if ever there was a case of such a happy accident, this is one."

* * * * *

When we ask why this curious reading appeals to Professor Findlay, we get the following answer. Translate the reading, and the meaning of it is: "God has a solution of the problems that are insoluble from the human point of view." The immediate problem is that of some erring brother in the community, a provoking creature who baffles his fellows by his obstinate refusal to listen to their remonstrances. Attempt after attempt has been made to deal with him. But no settlement is possible, and the Church has at last to excommunicate him from its membership. But not from the providence of God, Professor Findlay argues. Church excommunication "only turns the

brother concerned into one of the lost sheep, for whose rescue and recovery the Father is so eager."

* * * * *

So the argument is that we must not imagine the case of this man to be hopeless, simply because we have to give it up. Professor Findlay certainly gets a "lovely" meaning thus out of his reading of the text. It may be shaky, so far as its critical basis goes, but it is spiritually suggestive.

* * * * *

Another fresh interpretation is offered, in describing the betrayal scene at Gethsemane. Jesus, in our ordinary version, says to Judas, "Friend, wherefore art thou come?" "Friend" ought to be rendered "Comrade." That is obvious. But the Greek of the following words is difficult. Perhaps they are not a question at all; we might render them, "do your errand." However, Dr. Deissmann has drawn attention to a possible explanation, which Professor Findlay adopts.

* * * * *

Some drinking cups of the first century in Syria have been discovered with this Greek inscription: "Comrade, why are you here? Be merry." Did Jesus quote these words, which may have been on the very cup used a few hours before at the Last Supper, omitting "Be merry"? "If so," says Professor Findlay, it was "a last most moving appeal."

* * * * *

It is no argument against this interpretation that it implies Christ's knowledge of Greek. There is good evidence that Jesus was bilingual. "It would seem," as Professor Findlay argues, "that Jesus must have been able to make Himself understood in Greek, if He sought to appeal to all classes resident in or near Palestine." Certainly this interpretation corroborates the idea that Jesus understood Greek as well as Aramaic.

* * * * *

Mysticism has had its advocates, recently; probably there have been more expositions of it issued during the past ten years than in any similar period of our history. Popular and scientific discussions pour from the press still; philosophers as well as theologians are interested, not to speak of journalists. But lest mysticism be unduly exalted, other voices are lifting up their protest. Among them is the voice of Mr. Hugh E. M. Stutfield,

a vigorous popular writer. He has just published a book called *Mysticism and Catholicism*, which views these two movements as a trout-fisher would view a pair of cormorants or herons.

* * * * *

To mysticism Mr. Stutfield objects heartily. His pages contain some trenchant exposures of the ferocity, the sentimentalism, the immorality, and the eroticism, which have disfigured religious mysticism. It will be an eye-opener to some readers to see his quotations from some Catholic writers, and any sentimental admirers of Bossuet will do well to avoid this book. But he is not a materialist by any means. Much as he deplores the morbid and dangerous phenomena of mysticism, he realizes the inwardness of true religion. Indeed his great hope is that the dominating element "in the religion of to-morrow will be a higher and more enlightened mysticism, in which the clerical mediator will play a less important part than heretofore." And he illustrates this from his own experience.

* * * * *

Mr. Stutfield has been a mountaineer. Now, he suggests, the true mountaineer's creed is the mystic's creed; both rest on "the belief that the essence of life lies in exploration." The sense of the Beyond haunts and moves both. The mystic seeks to scale the dizzy peaks of consciousness, in order to attain a vision of the Infinite, and the mountaineer too has his passion for the possibilities that await him as he toils up the slopes.

* * * * *

In a moving passage Mr. Stutfield describes the really mystical emotions of the true mountaineer. He must be no mere climber. Mountaineering is not an exercise of muscles merely; it implies susceptibility to Nature in her grand and lonely moods. Awe and admiration are stirred in the mind of the climber. "All the cruelty and injustice, the anarchy and waste of the universe, are expunged from our consciousness. We cease to think of Nature as she is in the forests below, red in tooth and claw." On the heights the mountaineer has a better vision. "Yonder, in the distance, earth touches the sky, and in the far-off mountain mists the material world melts into the great Beyond." You may retort, says Mr. Stutfield, that all this is illusion, an emotional relationship with the universe which is of small value. Perhaps it is; yet "man does not live by bread alone, but also by senti-

ment, admiration, and (if you will have it so) by hallucination." So the attack on mysticism resolves itself into an onslaught upon the travesties and abuses of mysticism which characterize the ecclesiastical world. It is in the interests of true mysticism that Mr. Stutfield exposes the false lights and leaders of the movement.

* * * * *

What did the Feast of Tabernacles mean? It is one of the Old Testament festivals which are mentioned in the New Testament. Jesus, according to the Fourth Gospel, once attended it in Jerusalem, and used some of its symbolic rites to illustrate His teaching; in the seventh chapter of the Gospel we have a summary of this episode.

* * * * *

It is discussed in a paper reprinted by Dr. F. J. Badcock in his *Reviews and Studies* (pp. 121–126). He deals specially with the strange thirty-eighth verse of the chapter, which runs thus in our version: "he that believeth on Me, as the scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water." This accords with the rabbinic expression, to drink of a man's water, i.e. to receive his teaching. But some scholars demur to such a view, on the ground that believers receive the Spirit, they do not impart it. Dr. Badcock agrees with this view, and therefore prefers the interpretation which makes the water flow from Christ as the risen Messiah. The verse would then go with the preceding verse as follows: "If any man thirst, let him come unto Me, and let him drink that believeth on Me; as the scripture hath said, Out of his (*or* its) belly shall flow rivers of living water."

* * * * *

He proceeds to make another suggestion. Why does St. Paul refer to this in his word about the Israelites drinking "of a spiritual rock that followed them: and the rock was Christ?" Was this an independent reference? Perhaps. But possibly Paul was at this time in Jerusalem, closely connected with Gamaliel and the Pharisaic leaders. He may have overheard the saying.

* * * * *

The Old Testament passages upon this Feast of Tabernacles, or rather Feast of Booths, offer some problem of their own. We print this month a contribution to the subject from the pen of

Professor H. Gressmann, of Berlin. Dr. Gressmann requires no introduction to students of the Old Testament; his work is among the finest, and it is a pleasure to welcome this original theory that the Feast was developed out of a Canaanite festival of Adonis. The arguments adduced are certain to excite discussion. Dr. Gressmann, it may be added, is now the Editor of the *Zeitschrift für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, to which two adjectives may be fairly applied. It is international and it is indispensable. French, German, British, and American scholars now contribute to its pages, and no one who is working at the Old Testament can afford to miss a journal so living and thorough.

THE TEN BEST BOOKS ON PREACHING.

Peculiar difficulties await him who tries to write on the "best" books on Preaching. "Best" is almost always a relative term. Subjects where the factual element is predominant can, of course, be classified. The "best" books, in that case, are those which give most truth in the most lucid and persuasive way.

But the relative character of the term "best" comes out very forcibly when an attempt is made to classify the enormous output of really good books on Preaching. So much depends on the preacher: his capacity for, and interpretations of the function of, preaching; his present stage of development as a Christian man and preacher; the special section or denomination of the Christian Church to which he belongs and ministers; the country, district, conditions within whose influence he lives and to which he is called of God to minister.

Nothing but a relative classification will be made, therefore, in this article. The writer will speak of books which stand out in his own judgment and experience. Other books, perhaps of equal merit in the eyes of many, have been read and appreciated but are not mentioned here. The

counsel that preachers should read every available book on preaching is one to remember, act upon, and pass on. A man makes his own choice, and the "best" books are those which inspire him with the worthiest conceptions of preaching and instruct him in the means of perfecting himself as a preacher.

Preaching, to be really powerful and influential, must be a passion. No one will do much by it who does not live for it. Useful little homilies, suggestive little moral essays may be prepared and delivered or read out from the pulpit without much trouble by men of versatile gifts and busy lives. But such productions are not preaching as properly understood. People are, possibly, interested and even informed by them, but they are rarely moved to radical decisions. The supreme issues of life and the meaning of God in relation to their solution—the subject-matter of true preaching—are not so easily sized up in their nakedness and pressed home in their reality. The preacher must give himself up to them. They are at once his pain and his relief and joy. He must work, he must "watch and pray."

We must draw a distinction between the preacher and his sermon. The delivery of a good, soundly constructed sermon is not necessarily preaching. On the other hand, it is possible to have really great preaching which is open to homiletic criticism. But it remains true that the relation between preaching and sermonic construction is so close that power in the one is greatly increased by aptitude in the other.

The preacher should be assiduous in self-cultivation. The greater the stores of knowledge and experience the richer will he be in the qualities of his mind and spirit, and so much the richer will be the character of his preaching. "For their sakes I sanctify myself" should be a governing principle of his life. Nothing of worth and human interest will be alien

to his inquiry. What he gleans he will garner, and what he garners he will give out, sooner or later.

The wise preacher will not despise the "phonetics of declamation." He will try to understand and obey the rules governing his voice and its effective use. Nor will he count that time lost which he spends in perfecting his articulation and enunciation. He wants his message to be heard by all his auditors, and to be so heard as to attract rather than repel them from its serious consideration. Alexander Watson's recently published *Speak Out* will prove a boon to many.

The great writers of our (and other) literature can teach the preacher more than he can ever fully learn. Let him select and cultivate the friendship of some of them. Dr. Selbie, of Mansfield College, Oxford, used to urge his students to read Carlyle and Wordsworth, and surely those of them who followed his advice have preached the better for it.

I should like to suggest the enormous benefit to be derived from a study of great drama. The great tragedies of Shakespeare, read and pondered by themselves, and then re-read in the light of such a study as A. C. Bradley's *Shakespearean Tragedy*, are an illustration of what I mean.

History, too, ought to be familiar ground to the preacher. The range is so vast, however, that he should specialize in a period. Not able to take all let him take some of it to himself. God has been working out, through the ages, His world-embracing plans of redemptive good and History is our record of it. "One lesson and only one," says J. A. Froude, "History may be said to teach with distinctness; that the world is built somehow on moral foundations, that in the long run it is well with the good, in the long run it is ill with the wicked."

Preachers will find it profitable to listen to good preaching. Dr. Maclaren, of Manchester, used to say that he learnt how

to preach by hearing Dr. Thomas Binney at the King's Weigh House. A good sermon is always a means of grace in more senses than one.

The careful, analytical reading of some of the greater published sermons and speeches will amply repay the effort. Dr. Dale has some wise words on this in his book, referred to later. Collections of such sermons and speeches are easily accessible, e.g. *Crowned Masterpieces of Eloquence.* Analysis reveals the relation reason bears to emotion, how argument is clarified and enforced by illustration, what the aim of the preacher or speaker is, how he tries to achieve it, and how far he succeeds. Good passages may be learnt off by heart with advantage, for other and worthier purposes than securing a supply of "purple patches."

Rhetoric is a formal study too often overlooked by preachers. It is widely neglected (and suspected) in this country from fear of becoming artificial. Pomposity and obvious "art" are to be condemned, but preachers are less and not more likely to fall into such error if they have disciplined their minds and pruned and developed their style by putting themselves under the tutelage of such an ancient (yet modern) master as Aristotle (*Rhetoric*). Famous old books, too, are Quintilian's *De Institutione Oratoria* and Longinus *On the Sublime.* Archbishop Whately's book on *Rhetoric* is a modern book which can be safely recommended. Archbishop Trench's *Study of Words* and Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch's *The Art of Writing* can be profitably added to the list.

The preacher needs to know as much as possible of the History of Preaching. No study can be considered adequate which ignores origins and developments. Some knowledge of the "roll of honour" of the Christian pulpit will do much to engender a fitting dignity in the preacher's conception of his function and work. He will learn that he belongs to the

most illustrious body of men in all the world, engaged in what can be the most arduous and yet fascinating of tasks. He is not to be the hack of any Church or group, called to the routine of trifling duties, but the spokesman of God to his people and age. Then, again, the infinite variety of conditions under which preachers have lived and laboured will make him feel how vast is the scope of preaching and how varied are the types of preacher. He will be encouraged to be himself, and he will be delivered from the snare of feeble imitation or from the groove of the preaching of his own special church or age.

(1) The best general *History of Preaching* is that by Dr. E. C. Dargan (Hodder and Stoughton, 2 vols., 1911). Volume I takes the story from A.D. 70 to 1572; Volume II brings it up to the end of the nineteenth century (1900). This work is the fruit of the diligent study of original sources. The centuries and the countries where the Christian Church has had influence have been brought within the survey. It is largely free from sectionalism. Protestant and Roman Catholic preachers are equally considered and appraised with acumen, knowledge, and praiseworthy impartiality. The book is easy to read and will surely be read often by those who possess it.

Other books worthy of mention in this connexion, although they are occupied with periods or types of preaching, are *The History of Preaching* by Dr. John Ker (edited by the late Professor MacEwen), *Some of the Great Preachers of Wales* by Owen Jones, *The Preachers of Scotland* by Dr. W. G. Blaikie, and the two volumes entitled *Classic Preachers of the English Church.*

Nor must we forget the late Dr. John Brown's Yale Lectures on "Puritan Preaching" and the late Silvester Horne's Yale Lectures on "The Romance of Preaching." The latter especially are charming, full of the eagerness and

fervour of their gracious author. This book is probably the best work Horne ever did, as it was also his last. A splendid legacy to the Church.

(2) A valuable book, comprehensive, reliable, detailed, is Dr. A. E. Garvie's *The Christian Preacher* (T. and T. Clark: International Theological Library). Dr. Garvie here follows up and amplifies the good service he rendered in his earlier *A Guide to Preachers*. His style is rather heavy, but his matter is solid and well digested. All things considered, it is the best book available for the preacher. If he has this one only, and use it diligently, he will be equipped with a fair knowledge of and a great reverence for the work of preaching.

Rather more than half the book is given to the history of preaching. Here Dr. Garvie is working on the materials provided by such writers as Dargan. The second half is divided between a section dealing with "The Credentials, Qualifications and Functions of the Preacher" (involving discussions of the preacher as apostle, prophet, scribe, scholar, sage, seer, saint, priest, teacher, pastor, evangelist) and one on the "Preparation and the Production of Sermons." Dr. Garvie is one of our most learned theologians, a preacher of long experience, and a teacher of preachers, and he has here drawn out of his treasury things new and old for the profit of every reader.

(3) Another manual or textbook of high quality is Dr. John A. Broadus's *The Preparation and Delivery of Sermons* (Hodder and Stoughton, 1905). The first edition was issued in 1870, and the twenty-sixth (edited by Dr. E. C. Dargan) in 1905, so it has obviously been meeting a widely felt need. Nor are we surprised at this when we read the book. Broadus, a Baptist professor in Louisville, Kentucky, U.S.A., is obviously a scholar, an enthusiast, and a born teacher. He knows his subject and he knows men. His interests are wide, as is seen from the range of his references. His style

is strong and clear. Apart from a history of preaching the book is a complete manual of the work of the preacher, as distinguished from the pastor. Within these limits it is probably the best book available. The bibliography is judicious and adequate up to its date of 1905.

(4) Yet another manual, at once wider in conception and slighter in detailed treatment, is Dr. Oswald Dyke's *The Christian Minister and His Duties* (T. and T. Clark, 1908). The author was one of the great preachers of his day, exercising a most influential ministry at Regent's Square, London. Later he settled at Cambridge as Principal of Westminster (Presbyterian) College. This book is the fruit of his lectures there, and we should be grateful that he heeded the solicitations of former students that they be published.

The book is divided into four sections, with conventional headings. The treatment is living and instructive. Especially valuable is the section dealing with the minister as leader in worship. He is reminded that "all social worship moves betwixt these two poles of the Christian life:—self-consecration as the utterance of grateful praise for redemption by the Son, longing for more perfect holiness in the Spirit. In the synthesis of the two does the Church's communion with God complete itself on both its sides as a giving to God and a receiving from Him" (p. 98). Preaching is described as "that continuous and public testimony which the Church is always giving, through discourses by her official members, to her own living faith in Christ, as rooted in and sustained by the written Word of God" (p. 180).

Passing on from the more formal or systematic treatises, books of another character call for notice, e.g. those which dwell on various aspects of the preachers' work in a suggestive way but do not pretend to anything like completeness

of treatment. Most of the books to be mentioned are products of the "Lyman Beecher Lectureship on Preaching" founded at Yale, U.S.A., through the munificence of Mr. Henry N. Sage, of Brooklyn. The Church of Christ owes him a great deal. Lectures delivered on this foundation have had a profound influence for good upon the subsequent preaching of the Church.

(5) Foremost among these lectures on Preaching are those of Bishop Phillips Brooks, the great preacher of Trinity Church, Boston (*Lectures on Preaching*, H. R. Allenson). They were delivered in Yale Divinity School as long ago as 1877, but they remain to-day amongst the freshest and wisest and most moving lectures available. No preacher should fail to read them, especially perhaps the first and the last: "The Two Elements in Preaching," and "The Value of the Human Soul." But where all is so good it is dangerous to particularize. Phillips Brooks's definition of preaching has become classical: "Preaching is the communication of truth by man to man . . . the bringing of truth through personality" (p. 5).

(6) Exceedingly valuable, too, are Dr. R. W. Dale's *Nine Lectures on Preaching* (Hodder and Stoughton, 12th edition, 1902). The lectures are the product of wide experience, solid learning and genuine piety, couched in a style of stately and impressive eloquence. They will be read for a long time to come. Notable chapters are those on the Perils of Young Preachers, The Intellect in Relation to Preaching, and Evangelistic and Pastoral Preaching. It is hardly possible to put a better book into the hands of a young preacher. Its reading will convince him of the need of constant study conjoined with believing and persistent prayer. "Give Christ your best. Be faithful to Him—be faithful to your people—be faithful to yourselves. . . . You will thank God that He appointed you in this world to a

service which was the most perfect preparation for the larger life, the loftier activities, the everlasting glories of the world to come."

(7) What of the Old Testament and the preacher's use of it? Sir George Adam Smith's *Modern Criticism and the Preaching of the Old Testament* (Hodder and Stoughton, 1901) has given and continues to give badly needed guidance. The lectures are of outstanding merit. Delivered as long ago as 1899 their value is scarcely impaired by the great progress in the critical examination of the Old Testament which has taken place since then. The preacher who ponders these pages will find his way to a conception of God and His redeeming works in the world which is full of helpful suggestion for his work in a Christian pulpit. The Old Testament is a real propædeutic to the New Testament and the ministry of Jesus Christ.

The Old Testament's emphasis upon the nation, with the prophets as God's messengers to the nation, expressing His concern for national well-being, is the necessary corrective to a too individualistic interpretation of the Christian Gospel. The chapter, "The Preaching of the Prophets to their Own Times" is to be noticed in this connection. If procurable the author's *The Preaching of the Old Testament to the Age*—his inaugural address at Glasgow in 1892—should be read at the same time. Also his great studies of Isaiah, the Minor Prophets, and the recently published *Jeremiah*. So we learn how much the Hebrew prophet has to teach the Christian preacher.

(8) Many books have been written to help the preacher to a better understanding of the way in which he can effectively relate his Gospel to his age. The abiding realities of the Christian faith need to be formulated in the thought-forms of the day, and so related to and pressed upon the attention of the people. "Modern thought" is a fearful and cursed

thing to many preachers. But the ignorance and prejudice behind such an attitude must be overcome. The late Dr. P. T. Forsyth's *Positive Preaching and Modern Mind* (Hodder and Stoughton, 1909) is one of the best of his books. These Yale Lectures are something of an *Apologia Pro Fide Sua* and are a bracing tonic. Difficult to read, but emphatically worth reading. The Gospel is roundly stated to be "God's act of redemption" in Christ; it is positive and centres in the Cross. Preaching of the Gospel must therefore be positive and ethical, and it must be modern. The chapters are devoted to such matters as The Preacher and the Age, The Preacher and Religious Reality, The Moral Poignancy of the Cross. "There is nothing the Church needs more profoundly, though there are many things it needs more loudly, than an ethical conversion in regard to its great doctrines" (Epilogue, p. 371).

The Preacher and the Modern Mind, by Dr. George Jackson, deserves mention here as a competent and very readable piece of work, with many wise counsels and well-chosen extracts from standard writers.

(9) Most preachers will agree that C. H. Spurgeon's *Lectures to My Students* (three or four volumes, Marshall Bros.) claim a place in this list. They are very earnest, acute and racy lectures delivered to the men of his own (Pastors') College. The minister's call to the work, his private life and public activities, sermons (texts, aims, preparation, etc.), the use of the voice, gesture, the art of illustration, are among the many subjects which he handles. The most popular (and possibly the greatest) preacher of the modern world speaks through these lectures, and the discriminating reader will know how to use and value them. Volume II contains two most interesting chapters on Open-Air Preaching.

(10) The last book is an old one, and is included because

of its simply incalculable influence on the ministry of the post-seventeenth-century Church: Richard Baxter's *Reformed Pastor* (R.T.S., various editions). It has been issued several times since its first appearance in 1656. Almost all the editions, however, have been abridgments of the original. A new edition (edited by Dr. Powicke ?) would be of great service, and would probably be widely read.

There are two great chapters, each with its sections and sub-sections: (1) The Oversight of Ourselves, and (2) The Oversight of the Flock. Baxter pursues his subject with a Schoolman's and a Puritan's power of inexhaustible analysis, and with most heart-moving effect. The reading of this book will transform most men's ministry. As Dr. Doddridge said long ago: "The *Reformed Pastor* is a most extraordinary performance, and should be read by every young minister, before he takes a people under his stated care; and I think the practical part of it reviewed every three or four years; for nothing would have a greater tendency to awaken a minister's spirit to that zeal in his work, for want of which many good men are but shadows of what (by the blessing of God) they might be, if the maxims and measures laid down in that incomparable treatise were strenuously pursued."

This has been a long article and many books have been discussed or mentioned. My heart smites me as I think of the many not mentioned, by, e.g., Stalker, Jowett, Gillie, Gillies, Kelman, Cadman, Smith, Reid, and, of an earlier day, by Phelps, Beecher, Paxton Hood, Parker, Blaikie, and others. Let each preacher compile his own list and use it diligently. "Brethren," said Dr. J. H. Jowett, in concluding his Yale Lectures, "your calling is very holy. Your work is very difficult. Your Saviour is very mighty. And the joy of the Lord will be your strength."

E. W. Price Evans.

THE MYSTERIES OF ADONIS AND THE FEAST OF TABERNACLES.

I.

1. WERE there any mysteries of Adonis in Israel ?

What are mysteries ? In brief they are divine plays, mimodramatic scenes from the life or the myth of a deity, performed by priests and laymen, later also by professional actors ; one part is given in public, another in secret. Where the history of the mysteries is to be recognized clearly, as with those of Osiris in Egypt, there is seen a considerable change in the course of development. In earlier times the laity has a share only in the common spectacles which may be seen by every one ; the secret plays acted in the temple may be of greater importance, but they are reserved for the priests exclusively. As far as one can observe, there is no change before Hellenistic times. Henceforth, it is true, the public processions and spectacles remain, but even to the laity the chief element is now participation in the secret exhibitions in the temples or outside, in which they may be initiated, or in the acting of which they hope to win religious privileges. Often the term " mysteries " is used in the narrower sense in which it applies to the Hellenistic-Roman age ; but in this paper it is employed in the wider sense of the earlier period, as that alone can be taken into consideration in dealing with Israel.

We must ask more exactly : Were there public exhibitions taken from the life or the myth of a deity in Israel ?

We are inclined at first to answer in the negative ; for nowhere in the Old Testament is there any tradition of such mysteries, and if, nevertheless, their existence is asserted, the supposition which is put forward must always be uncertain. But such a theory is not only attractive, but is

scientifically justified if there are arguments in support, and it is even necessary if there are facts which can only be explained on this hypothesis.

Now, as is clear at the outset, life and Scripture need not always be identical; there is much *in vita* which is not to be found *in actis*. The traditions of the ancient culture of Israel are very deficient; the Old Testament—only one book—is all that survives of the Israelite library. Moreover we know from many examples that the writings collected in it have been worked over and transformed in the prophetic interests of the Deuteronomists or in the orthodox interests of the priestly Judaism. As far as possible all pagan or scandalous elements have been rejected, and amongst these must be included looking on at mysteries, because the plays draw down the deity into the sphere of mankind and therefore might injure the finer religious or ethical feeling of a later time. The absence of traditions in the Old Testament is no argument for the non-existence of mysteries in Israel. Mowinckel's recent general assertion that cultus always originates in drama, gives no help at all; for it may be exaggerated and its application to the religion of Israel may be disputed. Certainly in Israel also man's ideas have been conceived in mythical form, because mythical thinking and primitive or pre-scientific thinking are the same. But however many mythical ideas there are in the Old Testament, there is no trace of a specific Yahwe myth. This fact is the more remarkable as there are various survivals or echoes of myths, but all these hints must be derived primarily from other gods; they are only transferred to Yahwe secondarily. Thus it is most probable that there never was a specific Yahwe myth, and, in consequence, that there never were any specific Yahwe spectacles in Israel.

Nevertheless that very transference of foreign myths to Yahwe makes it possible to imagine the reception of foreign

mysteries into the Yahwe religion in the earlier period before the exile, especially if they are assumed to have been in the Baalism which influenced the Yahwism so deeply that for centuries the two religions were almost the same. Indeed, Adonis is known by his mysteries which are like those of Tammuz in Babylonia and Assyria or those of Osiris in Egypt. If, therefore, there were Yahwe mysteries in ancient Israel, they sprang out of the Adonis mysteries in Canaan.

2. We confine ourselves to the Feast of Tabernacles.

First of all there is a difficulty in the English name of this feast. The word " tabernacle " is inaccurate and confusing, because it is also employed for the tabernacle of the congregation. Now the tabernacle of the congregation was a tent of goats' hair (Ex. xxxvi. 14), but on the feast of tabernacles all that are Israelites born are said to dwell in " booths " (Lev. xxiii. 42). Since there is a marked difference between *tents* of goats' hair and *booths* of boards, branches and leaves, it is not permissible to associate the one with the other. Therefore we had better speak of a " Feast of Booths."

Like all the other agricultural feasts it must have been derived from the agricultural religion of Baal; but the agricultural origin has been recently attacked by Torczyner. Certainly in all traditions it is fixed by the calendar at the year's end as the festival of the New Year, falling upon the day of the full moon in the first autumnal month ; according to the later custom of beginning the year in the spring it was celebrated on the fifteenth day of the seventh month. Yet it is not to be separated from the other agricultural feasts with which it is enumerated. Its name is also " the Feast of the Ingathering " and therefore it is a harvest-feast without doubt, but it is kept after, not during, the ingathering, as the Revised Version of the English Bible rightly translates : " When thou hast gathered in thy labours out of the fields " (Ex. xxiii. 16) ; just on this account it could be fixed in the

calendar. Thence, belonging to September or October, it opens suitably the period of rain and the new harvest year.

Therewith accords the main and much discussed rite in the Feast of Booths, the rite of pouring water upon the altar, the intention of which is clear from many parallels collected by Frazer and from the Jewish traditions themselves ; for it is said : " Pour out the water before me on the feast that the rains of the year may be blessed to you," and even to-day special prayers for rain are connected with the Feast of Tabernacles in Judaism. The pouring out of water is a kind of sympathetic magic, or rather has a demonstrative character, causing the Lord also to pour out His rain. While in magic the demon is forced, in religion man is contented to remind the deity of his duties ; divine service is named in Hebrew and in Arabic *dhikr*, " reminding."

The solemn procession with *lulab* branches has likewise but one meaning, corresponding to the papyrus-maces and the lotus-flowers in the cult of Osiris or to the thyrsos-staffs in that of Bakchos, or to modern maypoles, the aim of which is generally recognized as the fertilization of the plants. When at the Feast of Tabernacles the branches are shaken and beaten so that the leaves fall off, then there is perhaps an imitation of the storm, with the intention of calling one (Torczyner)—storm and rain are always associated in the nearer Orient—or an admonition to the deity to produce new leaves ; at all events the rites hitherto discussed are connected with vegetation and are to be derived from the Baal religion.

The same explanation is probable for the booths. With what purpose were they erected ? The Tradition knows only that the Israelites dwell in them during the days of the Feast. They are often explained as rooms to provide lodgings for the festive strangers approaching in legions. The texts do not speak of them, but the lawgiver ought to

have mentioned them, because their meaning is by no means self-evident. Moreover, as we know from Hosea xii. 10, tents and not booths were set up for the foreign guests at the festival. There is no doubt that the Israelites, instead of living in houses, lived in booths during the feast of "Tabernacles." The fact would be intelligible at once if the huts had been erected, not inside the town, but outside in the fields or vineyards. Yet there is no mention of this. It is only said (Neh. viii. 16): "So the people made themselves booths, every one upon the roof of his house, and in the courts of the house of God, and in the street of the water-gate, and in the street of the gate of Ephraim." A change in the custom is often assumed when, in post-exilic times, the old practice of the country may have been transferred to the life of the towns; so the huts may have come from the country, where they were in place, into the courts and even on to the roofs of the houses. But the Palestinian agricultural towns are not to be confused with the gigantic cities of modern times and with the roof gardens of their "sky-scrapers"; for there the city men—even if bankers like the famous Tobias of the Zenon Papyri—remained in the closest touch with agriculture.

Now, to explain the strange feast of these booths, let us assume Baal to be identical with Adonis. This is certainly an assumption, but a good one, as it seems to me, because it really interprets what otherwise lacks explanation. Although the traditions are very scanty, we know in the first place that there were in fact booths of Adonis; one of them is fully described in the *'Αδωνιάζουσαι* of Theocritus. And secondly, these booths were erected on the roofs and in the courts; for the mourning for Adonis is kept there (Ezek. viii. 14; Plut., *Nicias* 13). Therefore the Feast of Tabernacles in Israel seems to be derived from an Adonis festival in Canaan.

3. In order to ensure success let us view the difficulties and examine certain details.

We may begin with the mourning for Adonis. This was observed in the courts and on the roofs. Why there? Because being the god of vegetation, he cannot be worshipped inside a house, but only in the open air. From the earliest times he dwells in Heaven, like Tammuz in the Babylonian Gilgamesh Epic, not in the fields or vineyards, like the chthonic deities of the Greeks; the mourning for Adonis corresponds to the cult of the Assyrian astral goddess, which is also performed upon the roofs.

But how is the mourning for Adonis compatible with the Feast of Tabernacles, the most joyful and free festival in Israel? No exact description of it or detailed law has been handed down to us from the pre-Deuteronomic period; there is therefore nothing to prevent our assuming, if we wish to do so, one day of mourning before (or after) the seven days of rejoicing. We do not, of course, expect to hear of Adonis or of his death on the feast of Yahwe, but are there no traces at all of solemnity or repentance? As a matter of fact such traces may be detected in no less than three passages :—

(i) In 1 Samuel vii. 6 the rite of pouring out water before the Lord—a rite not known except during the Feast of Tabernacles on a day not certainly fixed—is connected with fasting and confession of sins. The Deuteronomic tradition tells us that, as an immediate consequence of Samuel's cry, "The Lord thundered with a great thunder on that day, and discomfited the Philistines." The thunder is the answer of the vegetation-god (originally of Baal-Adonis, here of Yahwe) in whose honour the rites are carried out.

(ii) According to the law of the Priestly Code (Lev. xxiii.), the Day of Atonement on the 10th of Tishri precedes the Feast of Tabernacles on the 15th to the 22nd of Tishri, being

its introduction. Even on New Year's Day the 1st of Tishri, the blowing of trumpets serves as a reminder of the coming Feast of Tabernacles. So the whole period from the 1st to the 15th of Tishri is valid as a time of repentance. This does not seem to be an accident. The Day of Atonement, as the day of deepest contrition, belongs necessarily to the Feast of Tabernacles, as the feast of greatest joy, answering to the death of Adonis on the one hand with its excessive mourning, and to the resurrection of Adonis on the other hand with its excessive indulgence. There is, however, one difficulty, as we shall see; in the cult of Adonis the feast of his death *follows* his "resurrection."

(iii) Indeed, in Nehemiah viii.–ix. the Day of Atonement is absent. But there is a day of fasting and confession of sins *after* the Feast of Tabernacles on the 24th of Tishri, and it has long been supposed that this day of repentance was the precursor of the Day of Atonement. Therefore originally the mourning for Adonis would have been at the end of the period of rejoicing. Later, in order that the connexion with the death of Adonis might be unrecognizable, the festival was transformed, and the day of repentance (or atonement) placed before it.

4. Another difficulty arises from the other side, that of the Adonis religion. The Feast of Tabernacles is without doubt in the main a feast of rejoicing, but, as is said by Baudissin (*Adonis und Esmun*, p. 508 f.), the cult of Adonis may have been in the main of a serious character. In his opinion the chief ideas of the Phœnicians were bound up with the death of Adonis, who was mourned every year in spite of the conviction that he would not remain dead. He denies, not the idea, but the festival of the god's resurrection. I am not convinced. As we learn from Theocritus, our best guide, every festival of Adonis has two sides, at first that of joy, then the other of mourning. The same is true of the older

period. Baudissin's view contradicts two facts fundamental to Phœnician religion. (*a*) The satisfaction of the sexual instinct, although explained by Lucian as punishment in accordance with the finer feelings of the Roman period, is in the earlier age of natural and unbroken paganism an outlet for lust; the cultic intention was to cause the deity also to beget, and so to call forth fertility and growth in the whole world of vegetation—in short the "resurrection" of Adonis out of death into new life. (*b*) This is confirmed by the Adonis gardens, which Baudissin misunderstands. Frazer (*Adonis, Attis and Osiris*[2], p. 194) is right in saying: "They represented him, true to his original nature, in vegetable form, while the images of him which were carried out and cast into the water, portrayed him in his later human form. All these Adonis ceremonies, if I am right, were originally intended as charms to promote the growth or revival of vegetation; and the principle by which they were supposed to produce this effect was homœopathic or imitative magic. . . . The rapid growth of the wheat and barley in the gardens of Adonis was intended to make the corn shoot up; and the throwing of the gardens and of the images into the water was a charm to secure a due supply of fertilising rain." From this point of view we understand the booths as a parallel to the "gardens" although not imitating the growth itself; but the god of the green must naturally dwell in a green booth or hut.

5. If, however, this was so, then the booth was that of Adonis-Baal and afterwards of Yahwe. In that case Yahwe ought to have dwelt in it and not the Israelites. But why not both, the god and his worshippers? The god is present in his symbols; in the "gardens" or in the booth itself. The principal features of the Feast of Tabernacles are the eating, drinking and rejoicing before the Lord, i.e. with the god. The abundance of food and of wine is not accidental—Yahwe

was originally " a good god who does not like the vine " like the Arabian Shai' el-qaum—but the lord of the vine is honoured with drunkenness, and the worshippers demonstrate to their god what they want, that he may give food in abundance for the new year. May we not go a step further and suppose that the dancing and the cries of lust (Ex. xxxii. 18), the voice of joy and the voice of gladness, the voice of the bridegroom and the voice of the bride (Jer. xxxiii. 11) were magic imitations of the god's wedding feast, the ἱερὸς γάμος between Baal-Adonis and Baalath ? Was the booth at the same time a nuptial booth ? Indeed, the " resurrection " and the " wedding " of Adonis may be variant conceptions of the same fact.

As is easily understood, the law of Moses makes no mention of such an idea, for the wedding of Yahwe was a mythical conception too scandalous to be handed down in later times.

It is not said " You shall dwell in *my* booth," nor is the booth named " the booth of Yahwe." (The tent of Yahwe, the tabernacle of Yahwe, the tabernacle of the congregation, is quite another thing.) But are there no survivals in the Psalms or in the Prophets ? There are, as a matter of fact, more than one. I will not insist on the well-known betrothal of Israel-Canaan to Yahwe-Baal (in Hosea and elsewhere), although the idea is to be derived, not from the marriage of the prophet and his wife, but from the marriage of the heaven-god with the earth-goddess. Here the booth is wanting.

The most instructive poem is the promise in Isaiah iv. 2–6, which has a very badly preserved text, but is very old and very interesting. As far as I understand, the Lord will come to Mount Zion, and will hang over it as once He hung over Mount Sinai in cloud by day and in fire by night like a " bridechamber " or like a " booth " for shadow from heat and for refuge and covert from storm and rain. This is a

description of a theophany of Yahwe, when he has washed away the filth of the daughter of Zion and has purged the blood of Jerusalem from the midst of her. Then "the branch of the Lord" shall be beautiful and glorious, and "the fruit of the earth" shall be excellent and comely for all the escaped of Israel.

The conception of the cloud as the "booth of Yahwe" is found also elsewhere (Ps. xviii. 11, "pavilion," cf. cv. 39). The booth here and in the Feast of Tabernacles can hardly be meant as an imitation of the Sinai cloud, as Torczyner supposes. Originally, and even in Psalm xviii., the poet probably had in mind not the special Sinai cloud, but the thunder-cloud in general. If the god of vegetation sometimes dwells in a booth, it is easy to understand how this thunder-cloud in which he sometimes makes his home is also called a booth. But in Isaiah iv. the thunder-cloud is combined with the Sinai-cloud. Perhaps there were,not in the Old Testament yet in the time of the Prophet, phantastic legends about the cloud of Sinai protecting the people from heat and rain; so he is inspired to take the cloud of the Lord for the refuge and the covert of the holy remnant. Through this combination the original idea of the thunder-cloud has been slightly obscured, but is yet clear enough. In the first place "the branch of the Lord" or the "sprout of Yahwe" corresponds to the parallel "fruit of the earth" and indicates therefore the corn, although it is a very strange term. It will lose its strangeness if we assume that it had its origin in the Baal religion: the corn, the gardens, the booths were really "sprouts of Adonis" or Adonis himself. Then the idea is transplanted into the Yahwe religion, and so there can be no doubt that Yahwe here represents in the main the god of vegetation, not the God of Sinai. In the second place, with the figure of the "booth" is connected that of the "bride-chamber" (the Hebrew word is employed in the same sense

in Ps. xix. 5 and Joel ii. 16, but it never means "defence" as it is translated in the English Bible). This term cannot be explained from Mount Sinai or the Sinai-cloud, for there were no bridechambers there; but the thunder-cloud of Baal-Adonis may well be named a "bridechamber," like the booth of the Adonis festival in which the worshippers celebrate his "resurrection" or begetting by their own prostitution.

Reflecting on the traditions of the Old Testament about the Feast of Tabernacles and the figure of the booth, we may say that there are signs which are, perhaps, best interpreted as survivals of the Adonis festival. The mysteries of Adonis performed by his worshippers were, as it seems, the wedding and the mourning of the god in his booth. This "perhaps" will be changed into "certainly" if our supposition derived from indirect tradition is confirmed by direct accounts of the pagan religion of Adonis.

II.

1. What do we know of the pagan Adonis mysteries, and especially of his booths?

The most vivid description of a public performance is to be read in the *'Αδωνιάζουσαι* of Theocritus. It was celebrated at Alexandria in 273 B.C., furnished with great splendour by Queen Arsinoe, because her dead mother Berenice had been received amongst the goddesses. In the centre of the royal palace court stood a bed of state upon which Aphrodite and Adonis reclined. The sense of the scene requires only one bed; for the *ἱερὸς γάμος* is acted (instead of the Dual in v. 127 the Singular should be read, as I learned verbally from the late Hermann Diels). This has now been confirmed by an Ionic-Etruscan relief of the sixth century B.C. newly published in *Rassegna d'arte, antica e moderna* (1919, VI., p. 187, Fig. 3). The bedstead, in v. 84, inaccurately or clumsily

called " silver," was made of ebony, gold and ivory (v. 123), exactly like the beds of state now found in the grave of Tutankhamen. As we assume from these examples, in the wall at the foot of the bed Ganymede was to be seen in filigree work, borne upwards to Zeus by two eagles, an allusion, it seems, to the apotheosis of Adonis. On the couch were spread purple-coloured tapestries, and a slight bolster for the two lovers sleeping in each other's arms. Beside them were set ripe fruits, " Adonis-gardens," i.e. plants growing in baskets of silver, golden boxes of Syrian musk-salve, also pastry and cakes in the shapes of various birds and animals. Round about the bed went a bower of fresh verdure twined with anise. Young cupids played in it, fluttering from bough to bough like nightingales. A female singer came out, as Theocritus tells us in his *Eidyllion*, celebrating in song the love of the divine pair. At the same time she announced the harsh fate of Adonis ; even on the next day his body must be thrown into the sea. Women attired as mourners, with streaming hair and bared breasts, would bear his image to the shore and would commit it to the waves with the liturgic cry : " come back again," hoping that the lost one would come back again a year later in new beauty of youth.

So here are distinguished two acts in the festival of Adonis ; the feast of marriage in the bower, and then the mourning procession from the bower to the sea-shore. The attitude of mind in one part is the opposite of that in the other ; here the marriage rejoicings, there the death lamentation. If life is devoured by death, the marriage-bed has become the bier. In the cult the one will be suddenly changed to the other, as the carnival is changed to Ash-Wednesday. Adonis is still living when the scene closes, and only the skill of the poet allows us to hear the undertone of the mourning song in the wedding hymn. The date of the ceremonies is not stated,

but the ripe fruits indicate the autumn. On the basis of a bill in the Flinders Petrie Pap. III Gustave Glotz assumes with ingenious and brilliant but unsound arguments that the feast took place at the end of October or in the beginning of November, and lasted three days.

The feast here described which provokes the curiosity of the people was of royal splendour but not a new one ; nothing is said about new ceremonies. The elements in their most simple form will have been the same in Alexandria wherever the Adonis festival was celebrated by the people. After the ingathering of the harvest bowers were erected in the courts of the houses, with two images of the deities on a couch surrounded by " gardens," fruits, myrrh and cakes. Probably the images were most like the vegetative " corn-bodies " of Osiris, or, still more simply, there were only " gardens." At all events the idea was always the same. In those booths the wedding of the divine pair was celebrated during several days. On the last day the death of the god was acted ; women performed the mourning rites and threw the Adonis-image into the sea, because the god found his death or " dwelt " there.

But are we right in supposing that the Adonis festivals had the same character outside Alexandria and in pre-Hellenistic times ? According to the Phœnician myth Adonis is torn by a bear or a boar ; the drowning in the sea is secondary, and is transferred from Osiris to Adonis. The mourning acted on the sea-shore at Alexandria and at Byblos (influenced by Egypt) belonged originally to the mountains, the rivers and the springs ; the best known is the *Nahr Ibrahim*, the Adonis river, with its various rock sculptures and with the famous sanctuary at its spring near Aphaka. Thus the Phœnicians and the Canaanites threw their Adonis " images " into the rivers and the springs so as to bring them near to the god himself.

But if the mourning of Osiris has somewhat influenced the Adonis ceremonies at Alexandria, the question of the wedding rites arises. Here too Egyptian colouring is not to be denied. Not that the idea of marriage was an offspring of the Osiris religion, quite the contrary ; we know nothing or only a little of it in Egypt. The ἱερὸς γάμος is rather an old Sumerian and Semitic conception ; the wedding bower belongs certainly to the Adonis religion from the earliest times. But where the begetting of the god in the booth and the growing of the plants is represented, there the man could hardly have been wanting ; indeed prostitution is a characteristic feature of the Adonis cult in Phœnicia, acted at Aphaka till the time of Constantine. Yet it is a marked feature of the Egyptian spirit that the especially Semitic paroxysm of sex in the worship of the deity is not evident in Theocritus. So the Adonis cult has undergone the same changes as generally in Israel ; the original holy intercourse between the sexes is in some places offensive, and is condemned by religious feeling as lasciviousness, sometimes—and last of all—in Phœnicia and Syria according to Lucian. From that point of view we understand the polemic of the Prophets against cultic prostitution as a polemic against the chief rite of the Adonis festival, never to be extirpated till the time of Ezra and Nehemiah ; then the old custom at the Feast of Tabernacles was radically changed, " for since the days of Jeshua the son of Nun unto that day had not the children of Israel done so " (Neh. viii. 17).

This is the only extant example of bowers in the pagan Adonis cult, but it is a sufficient argument, certified, as we may now say with some certainty, by the Canaanite-Israelite Adonis-Yahwe feast of " Tabernacles."

2. Let us now briefly review the bowers of other religions. They are of the greatest importance in the Egyptian religion as we have learned from W. B. Kristensen. The leaf-hut

is there an indispensable element in funeral rites. It is not to be explained, as it usually is, as due to the desire of the dead to refresh himself and to recover his strength in a bower as the living do, but as due to the identification of the dead with Osiris. The plant-pavilion is a vegetation temple, and therefore the natural dwelling of the vegetation-god, not only of Osiris, but also of Ptah, the earth-god of Memphis. So we understand the abundance of food, of branches and flowers in the leaf-hut as food and leaf offerings to the god of vegetation. The kings, and sometimes others of the dead too who are represented in the holy tree, are identified with the god of life. Instead of the dead, or rather instead of Osiris, now and then papyrus or lotus stalks are used ; these are not only " symbols " of resurrection but the god himself, they are Osiris or the young Horus born in a lotus-flower. Similar customs are known in the Attis cult ; the *cannophoroi* and *dendrophoi* carry reeds and trees which are Attis himself. In the growth of the plants the imperishable life of the earth is to be seen manifesting itself ; with this divine life the dead is identified. The leaf-hut in the Osiris and funeral cults is not Semitic, but the ideas are nevertheless the same as those which appear in the booths of the Adonis cult.

According to Kristensen the hieroglyph for Upper Egypt does not represent, as is usually supposed, a prehistoric dwelling-house, but probably the holy hut of the earth- and death-god twisted of reed. In form and idea this hut was most closely related to the bower in the funeral cult, whose erection was a holy action intended to give material being to the resurrection or the future life of the deceased.

Lastly, the *Sed*-feast too is, according to Kristensen, a feast of tabernacles, on the first of Tybi, on the day of the ascension to the throne and of the new year celebrated in honour of the rising Horus, who, in the figure of the king,

ascends to the throne of his dead father Osiris. This ascension takes place in "the white hut of the Great Ones," i.e. of the dead, or in a pavilion erected on the hill appearing from the flood water in which Osiris has found his death. Sometimes the pavilion is set up on the roof of the temple where the Osiris mysteries are celebrated. Amongst the offerings is especially remarkable the offering of the king to his father, the dead god of vegetation, existing in the products of Egypt like the plant- and food-offerings in the funeral cult.

In the Babylonian Tammuz mysteries the same two rites of mourning and wedding are to be recognized as in the Adonis mysteries. However, whether there were bowers we no longer know, but I do not doubt that there were.

In the Attis cult we should compare the feast of the pyre known to us from Tarsus and from Hieropolis in Syria. The coins of Tarsus often exhibit an altar adorned with wreaths and figures, and resting on it the funeral pile like a bower in conical tent form, with the figure of Sandon-Heracles in the middle of it, standing on a horned lion and holding in one hand a flower and in the other an axe. An eagle with outspread wings perches on the top of the pyre to bear the soul of the burning god to heaven. The Baal of Tarz is only another form of Adonis-Attis. At Hieropolis, as we learn from Lucian (*Dea Syria*, c. 49), "they cut down tall trees and set them up in the court; then they bring goats and sheep and cattle and hang them living to the trees; they add to these birds and garments and gold and silver work. After all is finished, they carry the gods around the trees and set fire under; in a moment all is in a blaze" (Strong's translation). The god himself is burnt also, as is obvious from the corresponding rite at Tarsus and from the tradition of Firmicus Maternus (27, 2) that the pine as representing the god whose image was fixed on it, was burnt a year later. Frazer has shown how the parallels of the Maypole in modern

folklore explain the customs of the Attis religion. The ideas are always the same as in the Attis cult, with the chief difference that the offering is transferred to the heaven-god by fire. Perhaps in Israel too there were burnings for Adonis, as may be assumed from Jeremiah xxxiv. 5 (cf. 2 Chron. xvi. 14 and xxi. 19).

But there would be many more problems to be solved if I were to take into account all the direct or indirect allusions in the Old Testament to Adonis (e.g. Isa. xvii. 10–11, Jer. xxii. 18 and xxxiv. 5, Dan. xi. 37, 1 Kings xii. 24 *m* LXX. Swete), and the Adonis motives, the branch with the cluster of grapes borne by two men upon the staff (Num. xiii. 23), or the legend of Aaron's budding rod (Num. xvii.), or the mourning of the daughters of Israel in the mountains (Judges xi. 40). I am quite satisfied if I am right in stating that the Feast of Tabernacles is to be derived from a Canaanite booth feast of Adonis, and that its ceremonies are to be explained as being originally publicly exhibited mysteries of Adonis' resurrection or wedding and of his death.

Note on the Literature.—J. G. Frazer, *Adonis, Attis, Osiris*. London, 1907.—Wolf W. Graf von Baudissin, *Adonis und Esmun*. Leipzig, 1911.—Paul Volz, *Das Neujahrsfest Jahves (Laubhüttenfest)*. Tübingen, 1912.—Gustave Glotz, "Les fêtes d'Adonis sous Ptolemée II" (*Revue des études grecques*, XXXIII, 1920, p. 169 sq.).—Sigmund Mowinckel, *Psalmenstudien II : Das Thronbesteigungsfest Jahwäs und der Ursprung der Eschatologie*. Kristiania, 1922.—P. Saintyves, *Essais de Folklore Biblique*. Paris, 1922 : "La verge fleurie d'Aaron, ou le thème du bâton sec qui reverdit," pp. 61–138. Harry Torczyner, *Die Bundeslade und die Anfänge der Religion Israels*. Berlin, 1922. —Hugo Gressmann, "Tod und Auferstehung des Osiris nach Festbräuchen und Umzügen" (*Der Alte Orient*, XXIII, 3). Leipzig, 1923.—W. B. Kristensen, "De Loofhut en het Lofhuttenfeest in den Egyptischen Cultus" (*Mededeelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afdeeling Letterkunde*, Deel 56, Serie B, No. 6), Amsterdam, 1923, pp. 179–198.—Erich Ebeling, *Ein Hymnenkatalog aus Assur*. Berlin, 1923.—Rudolf Kittel, "Osirismysterien und Laubhüttenfest" (*Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, 1924, XXVII, Nr. 7), pp. 385–391 and "Das Adonisfest in Alexandria" (*Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, 1925, N.F. 2, No. 9), pp. 431–435.

H. Gressmann.

SOME NOTES ON NAHUM I.–II. 3.

(*b*) The Date of the Book.

It was thought by the older expositors of Nahum that his oracle was of the same period as Isaiah xxxvi.–xxxvii., and was called forth by the same imminent peril—the siege of Jerusalem by Sennacherib *circ.* 700.[1] Such a view is now untenable, as the book cannot have been written earlier than the date of the capture of Thebes (No-Amon) in Upper Egypt by Assur-bani-pal king of Assyria, which is referred to iii. 8–10. This event took place about 663 [2] and is spoken of by the prophet as a fact of history. There is no need to assume with Schrader and Wellhausen [3] that the prophet must have written his book soon after this event and while it was fresh in his mind, and that if he wrote long after it could not have been this that he alluded to. The fall of so renowned a city was an event of world-wide interest. The march of the Assyrian armies into Upper Egypt, the capture of the entire city, the enormous spoils and vast numbers of prisoners taken, and the safe return to Nineveh [4] were events as little likely to be forgotten as the battles of Waterloo and Sedan are to-day. As Cornill [5] observes, all such happenings in Egypt were of vital importance to Judah. The prophet naturally recalled them as he recalled the still earlier siege of Jerusalem and plunder of Judea. All were crowning instances of the ferocity and avarice of the Assyrians, "the lion who filled his holes with prey and his dens with torn carcases" (Nahum ii. 12). So

[1] Pusey, *Min. Proph.*, iv. 357. Gandell in Speaker's *Com.* vi., 635.
[2] Schrader, *Die Keilinsch. und das A.T.*, 2nd Ed. 452; Billerbeck-Jer., p. 95.
[3] *Skizzen u. Vorarbeiten*, Heft 5, 3rd Ed. 164.
[4] See the texts Schrader, u. s.; Driver, *Authority and Arch.*, 113–14.
[5] *Einleit*, 7th Ed. 204.

when he sought for a parallel to Nineveh, a city of vast extent and population situated on a noble river, with magnificent temples and palaces full of riches, with tributary nations to swell her armies, he found all in Thebes.[1] "Art thou better[2] than No-Amon?" he says. "She was carried away, she went into captivity. *Thou* also shalt seek a stronghold because of the enemy." Wellhausen[3] doubts whether Nahum could be referring to the Assyrian conquest of Thebes, as Nineveh might have replied to his question, "Yes, I am better, for I conquered her." But the prophet saw further and more clearly than proud Nineveh. Isaiah had prophesied that Jahveh would move the whip over Ashur and lift the rod over him as it was lifted over Egypt (Isa. x. 26), and Nahum knew that the fate of Thebes would sooner or later overtake her conqueror. This reflection might be made at any time and is no indication of the date of the oracle.

Jerome records[4] that one of his Jewish teachers informed him that *No-Amon* meant *Populous Alexandria* (treating אמון as equivalent to המון), and accordingly he translated the words in Nahum iii. 8 *Alexandria populorum*. Similarly in Jeremiah xlvi. 25 he translates *tumultum Alexandriæ* and in Ezekiel xxx. 14 *in Alexandria*. He explains that this city had the earlier name of No and that he calls

[1] See a good note in Pusey, *op. cit.*, 388 f.

[2] הֲתֵיטָבִי is imperf. Kal. Ges. K., 70e.

[3] *Skizzen*, 5. 159.

[4] "Hebræus qui me in Scripturis erudivit ita legi posse asseruit *numquid melior es quam No-Amon*, et ait, Hebraice NO dici *Alexandriam* AMON autem *multitudinem* sive *populos*. Non quod eo tempore Alexandria vocaretur quippe quæ longo post tempore ab Alexandro Magno Macedone nomen accepit sed quia sub nomine primo id est NO semper Aegypti metropolis fuerit." Comm. Nahum, opp. ed. Vallarsi, vi. 570. "Alexandria quæ hodie sic vocatur. Ceterum pristinum nomen habet NO, quod Aquila Symmachus et Theodotion sicut in Hæbreo positum est transtulerunt. Pro quo nescio quid volentes LXX dixere Diospolis quæ Ægypti parva civitas est. Nos autem pro NO Alexandriam posuimus per anticipationem quæ Græce πρόληψις appellatur." Com. Ezek. xxx. 14, opp. v. 357.

it Alexandria by anticipation and proleptically. It is not difficult to understand how this view came about. Thebes never recovered from the crushing Assyrian blow. By the time of the Persian conquest it was depopulated and deserted,[1] and in Jerome's day, as in ours, it consisted of the majestic ruins of Medinat Abu, Karnak, and Luqsor. It may well be that Jerome had never heard of this Thebes. Apparently he only knew of the other Thebes, the Greek *Diospolis parva*, a town in the Delta close to the sea (afterwards Damietta).[2] Egypt to him was represented by the splendid city where the LXX translation was made, and where Origen had taught.

The LXX translators gave no countenance to this idea. They misread the text,[3] but translated "the portion of Amon." This was a most appropriate designation of No-Amon or Thebes where the chief priests of the god Amon were regal in their state and actually founded a dynasty (the 21st) of Egyptian kings.[4]

This notion of Jerome has an interest for us because Happel has founded upon it a most extraordinary theory He suggests that the book of Nahum was composed in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, *circ.* 170, that "Nineveh" is allegorical and represents the realm of the Seleucids, and similarly that No-Amon-Alexandria means the realm of the Ptolemies, both realms being enemies and oppressors of the Jews. He thinks that each chapter had a different author, that chapters ii. and iii. were written at the beginning of the

[1] Brugsch, *Hist. Egypt*, E.T. ii. 288; Breasted, *Hist. Eg.* 560.

[2] Brugsch, ii. 348, 418.

[3] The LXX have ἑτοιμάσαι μερίδα Ἀμμών, reading for מְנָה־מָנֹא (see Exod. xxix. 26). Syro-Hex. has the same reading, Luc. ἑτοιμάσαι μερὶς Ἀμμών. A.Σ.Θ. seem to have read ὑπὲρ Ἀμών. The Syro-Hex. in a marginal note identifies "Amon" with "Alexandria." Field, Hex. ii. 1008. The LXX in Ezek. xxx. 14 and 16 translate נֹא by Διοσπόλις, which was the Greek name of Thebes. Brugsch, ii. 347.

[4] Maspero, *Hist. Anc.* ii. 563; Brugsch, ii. 200.

persecution under Antiochus to promise the ruin of the Seleucids under the figure of the destruction of Nineveh, and that chapter i. came later at the time of the first victories of the Maccabees. There are so many difficulties in the way of this theory that it is hard to know where to begin.

(*a*) The theory is incompatible with the language of Nahum iii. 8–10, which describes a fact that has happened, not a vision of future calamity. "Art thou better than No-Amon . . . she went into captivity . . . thou too shalt seek a stronghold from the enemy." The past event is the example of the future ruin. As one mighty city fell, so with like circumstances of horror will the other. Therefore this allusion would have no meaning in the time of Antiochus—he did *not* take Alexandria. "Just as he lay before Alexandria . . . the Roman envoy Gaius Popillius, a harsh rude man, arrived and intimated to him the orders of the senate that he should restore all that he had conquered and should evacuate Egypt within a set time. Antiochus asked time for consideration, but the consular drew with his staff a circle round the king and bade him declare his intentions before he stepped beyond the circle. Antiochus declared he would obey and withdrew." [1] A striking reverse like this could not have been used as a presage of future victory over the Seleucids or anybody else. The verses about No-Amon could not have been written in 168, they had no relevancy to the events of the day.

(*b*) Not only does Nahum allude twice (ii. 8, iii. 7) to Nineveh and once (iii. 18) to the king of Assyria, but his language throughout is suitable, and only suitable, to a specific city known to him—not to a visionary and figurative realm. *Out of thee* came a wicked councillor (i. 11), the *house* of thy gods (i. 14), the *streets*, the *squares* (ii. 4),

[1] Mommsen, *Hist. Rome*, E.T., ii. 309. See also Josephus, *Ant.*, xii. 5. 2.

the *wall* (ii. 5), the *river gates*, the *palace* (ii. 6), the *strongholds*, the *gates of the land*, the *bars* (iii. 13), the *brickworks* (iii. 14). He depicts the movements of the *chariots* (ii. 4, 13), the ferocity of the *armies* (ii. 11, 12, iii. 1), the practices of *witchcraft* (iii. 4), the stores of *wealth* (iii. 9), the number of *merchants* (iii. 16). None of these traits point to any figurative or secondary meaning or have any bearing on the realm of the Seleucids or the character or exploits of Antiochus. But applied to Nineveh every expression is suitable and in its place. And the whole of the book is no more like an allegory than the description of a city in a guide book.

(*c*) Happel justifies his late dating of the book on the ground that it represents the Jews as oppressed under a foreign rule. This may be true, but it does not lead to any such conclusion. For it was certainly the case during the period from Hezekiah to Josiah. It is not to be supposed that the repulse of the Assyrians from the walls of Jerusalem freed Judah from their suzerainty. Hezekiah was and remained a vassal to the Assyrian king.[1] As regards his successor, Manasseh, there is clear evidence to the same effect. It appears from Assyrian lists of tributary kings that "Manasseh king of Judah" was with twenty-one other kings a vassal of Esarhaddon and afterwards of Assur-bani-pal.[2] It further appears from the statement in 2 Chronicles xxxiii. 11 (the truth of which we see no reason to doubt [3]) that for some fault or revolt which is not stated the generals of the king of Assyria seized Manasseh and dragged him in chains to Babylon where King Assur-bani-pal was then residing. He was subsequently released, but

[1] Kittel, *Gesch.*, 2nd Ed., ii. 515.

[2] Schrader, *Die Keilinsch.*, 2nd Ed., 354–7 ; Driver, *Auth. and Arch.*, 112.

[3] So Schrader, *op. cit.*, 366–8 ; Kittel, *op. cit.*, 526 ; Maspero, *Hist. Anc.*, iii. 369 ; Sayce, *Higher Crit. etc.*, 458–461.

the Jews must have felt very bitterly the shame of seeing the son of Hezekiah, the king of the house of David, carried away captive to his Assyrian lord. When, therefore, Nahum wrote "Now I will break his yoke from off thee and tear thy bonds asunder . . . no longer shall Belial pass through thee" (i. 13–15), he thought of the yoke of tributary vassalage, the bonds of tribute, the frequent marches of Assyrian armies through the land. There is no reason to postdate his oracle about 400 years to make it refer to anything else.

(*d*) Happel justifies his late dating of Nahum by pointing to the fact that this prophet did not, like many of the pre-captivity prophets, reprove the sins and idolatries of the Jewish people, but that all his denunciations were reserved for their enemies. It is obvious to point to Habakkuk where the same feature is to be observed, but Happel also relegates *him* to an equally late date. But we think that good reasons can be given why Nahum should differ in this respect from Isaiah and Micah on the one hand and from Jeremiah and Ezekiel on the other. In his time the Assyrian horror in Palestine had lasted 100 years. The incursion of Tiglath-Pileser into and deportation from Gilead and Galilee (2 Kings xv. 29)—the capture of Samaria and captivity of its inhabitants—the occupation of Judah and siege of Jerusalem by Sennacherib—the vassalage and captivity of Manasseh—the marches of armies through the land to Egypt—had kindled in the prophet's mind a fury of hatred against the Assyrian power which left no room for any emotion except joy at their impending ruin. Nahum had only one thought *Delenda est Ninive*. It may be added that after the publication of Deuteronomy and the energetic reforms of Josiah many of the worst abuses of religious practice against which earlier prophets had declaimed seemed in a fair way to be removed. When Nahum promised that

his countrymen should now be able to keep their feasts without being disturbed by Assyrian invasion (i. 15) they could be thought of as purified feasts. The book is in this respect quite suitable to the time at which it was written.

(*e*) It is surprising that Happel has not seen that if Nahum had been written *circ.* 170 the diction must have been very different from what it is. Had this book been issued about the same time as Daniel it must have contained some Aramaic Persian or Greek words as that book does, or Mishnic idioms like those found in Ecclesiastes.[1] It may be asserted with confidence that the fine pure Hebrew of Nahum could not have been written at that late period or it must have shown some of these characteristics of the late Hebrew style. On the other hand, it contains one foreign word of great significance, טִפְסַר, *tiphsar* (iii. 17), which is the Assyrian *dupsarru*, "writer on tablets—man of letters."[2] In the time of Assur-bani-pal, who was a bibliophile and a scholar and who founded a library at Kouyunyik within his capital, these scribes occupied a distinguished position at the court of Nineveh and enjoyed great royal favour. The way Nahum speaks of them as high officials of the king was suitable at his date; it would not have been intelligible 400 years after Nineveh perished.

(*f*) In the book of the Wisdom of Jesus the Son of Sirach (Ecclesiasticus), in a section headed "The praise of the Fathers," these words occur (xlix. 10), "And of the twelve prophets let their bones flourish again out of their place, for they comforted Jacob and delivered them by assured hope."[3] From the preface to the book by the author's

[1] See Driver, *Int.*, 9th Ed. pp. 473 f., 501–8.

[2] Fried. Delitzsch, *Hebrew and Assyrian*, 1882, p. 13; Schrader, *op. cit.*, 424, 617; Billerbeck-Jer., p. 105.

[3] *καὶ τῶν ιβ* (A. *δωδεκα*) *προφητῶν τὰ ὀστᾶ ἀναθάλοι ἐκ τοῦ τόπου αὐτῶν παρεκάλεσεν* (A. *αν*) *δὲ τὸν Ἰακώβ καὶ ἐλυτρώσατο* (A. *σαντο*) *αὐτοὺς ἐν πίστει ἐλπίδος.* These words appear in the recovered Hebrew fragment. See Nowack, *Die Kleinen Propheten*, 3rd ed., pp. 1, 242.

grandson it appears that the latter translated his grandfather's book into Greek about 130 and that the LXX translation of "the Law, the prophets, and the other books of the Fathers" had then been completed.[1] The date when Jesus Son of Sirach wrote his book is considered to be *circ.* 190 to 170.[2] How, then, it may be asked, could he praise "the twelve prophets" when two of them, Nahum and Habakkuk, had not yet been written? Happel suggests that he praised the men and not the books, but this view will not meet the difficulty. In all probability the son of Sirach, like ourselves, knew nothing about Nahum except his book and what is said in it. But he evidently knew "the twelve prophets" *as a collection*, just as the Jewish Rabbis did when they wrote, "The men of the great assembly wrote (that is, edited) the twelve prophets."[3] His words, "they comforted Jacob," are specially appropriate to Nahum "the comforter."[4] It does not admit of serious doubt that the son of Sirach knew of "the twelve prophets" as part of the second division of the Canon, "the prophets" named in his grandson's preface, and that Nahum's book was included in the twelve. It follows that this book was received into the Jewish Canon long before the date suggested by Happel for its composition.

We entirely reject this baseless hypothesis and the equally baseless suggestion of Jerome's Hebrew instructor, and adhere to the view generally held, that Nahum wrote sometime after the capture of Thebes in 663 and before the capture of Nineveh in 612.

The question of the exact date of Nahum has been much discussed, and several alternative dates have been suggested.[5] It is not proposed to discuss them all here, as the

[1] See Cannon, *Song of Songs*, 81. 127, n. 3.
[2] Levy in *Jewish Enc.*, art. "Sirach."
[3] Baba Bathra i. 5, trans. Rodkinson, v. (xiii.), p. 45.
[4] See Billerbeck-Jer. 91 and note. [5] See Davidson, p. 15.

writer is convinced that the *final* siege of Nineveh, which ended in its fall, was the event which called forth this prophecy.[1] It is now well known that the last king of Assyria, Sin-shar-ishkun (the Saracus of the Greek authors), ruled over a country sadly shorn of its ancient glories. The empire had been seriously weakened by the inroads of the Scythian hordes, and was further crippled by the successful revolt of Nabopolassar who had made himself the independent ruler of Babylonia. This monarch had succeeded in gaining the friendship and alliance of Kyaxares king of Media, and the two allies entered upon the decisive campaign with an understanding as to the division of the lands to be conquered. The Scythians for some unexplained reason joined this alliance. In the year 612 the allied armies marched by the bank of the Tigris and formed the siege of Nineveh. The city held out for two and a half months. Three battles took place, of which no details are known. Then in the month of Ab (July–August) a mighty assault was made on the city ; it was taken, and there was a great havoc of the chief men. There can be no doubt that the king perished. The allies plundered the spoil of the city, a quantity beyond computation, and they turned proud Nineveh into "a mound and a ruin." [2]

We believe that the oracle of Nahum was written during this final siege of Nineveh, while these tremendous events were taking place. Very impressive is the tone of confidence and triumphant certainty that runs through the book. He has no doubt that this is to be the end. It will not fail like former sieges when the Median assailants were repulsed

[1] See Wellhausen, p. 160 ; Cornill, p. 203. ¡Wellhausen adds : "Die Frage ob die Judäer gegen den sterbenden Löwen noch solche Gefühle haben könnten lässt sich dreist bejahen."

[2] Maspero, *Hist. Anc.* iii. 483–5 ; Billerbeck-Jer. 96, 113 ; Winckler, *Altorient. Untersuchungen*, 62–63 ; C. I. Gadd, *The Fall of Nineveh*, 1923, 13–15, 39–40.

from the walls of the city. We cannot tell what means of information he commanded, but it seems likely (i. 15) that news of important successes gained by the besiegers had reached Judea. A sense that they would certainly prevail animates every line of the book. Thus in i. 9, reflecting on the siege of Jerusalem and other Assyrian wrongs done to his country, he bursts out: "What did you devise against Jahveh?" [1] and proceeds with absolute conviction:

> "*He* is making an utter end.
> Affliction [2] shall not rise twice."

This is the last siege of Nineveh. It will not need to happen again.

Then in i. 12 there is the same conviction of final ruin:

> "Thus saith Jahveh, ruler over many waters,
> They hasten, they pass away." [3]

Nineveh relied for her defence on her rivers, ditches and moats of water (ii. 7).[4] But what will they avail against the will of Jahveh who is supreme Lord of these and all other waters?

Already the prophet sees the city captured and the fugitive inhabitants hastily fleeing away in all directions.

"If I afflict thee,[5] I will not afflict thee any more." This passage shows how convinced the prophet was that this was the *final* affliction of Nineveh and would never need to be repeated.

In i. 14 he turns to the Assyrian royal house with the con-

[1] For this use of חשׁב אל comp. Jer. xlv. 20, l. 45.

[2] The word צָרָה points to the distress of a siege. See Isa. xxx. 26, where לֶחֶם צַר is used to denote the short rations of besieged men.

[3] For the difficult words אִם־שְׁלֵמִים וְכֵן רַבִּים we read with the LXX (and Syr. nearly) *κάταρχων ὑδάτων πολλῶν* = מֹשֵׁל מַיִם רַבִּים, and for נָגוֹז וְעָבָר we read נָזוּ וְעָבְרוּ (Marti, see Ps. cx. 10), which is much more appropriate.

[4] Billerbeck-Jer. 101–2; Davidson, 34.

[5] וְעִנִּיתִךְ is a hypothetical perfect (Driver, *Tenses*, § 154 and n. 2).

viction that the present king is the last of his line. "No more of thy name shall be sown."

The gods in whom he trusts—Ashur the tutelary divinity of the realm, Sin after whom the king is named—will share his ruin.

"From the house of thy gods I will cut off graven image and molten image;
I will make thy grave."

This strong feeling of certainty is equally apparent in the prophet's words addressed to Judah. *Now* will the yoke be broken, the fetters torn asunder (i. 13). Already the messenger bringing the glad tidings seems to be nearing the Judean hills, "Belial is utterly cut off" (i. 15).

To this may be added some indications of the progress already made by the besiegers towards the capture of the city. "The river gates are opened" (ii. 6). This seems to refer to the great sluices whose waters are threatening to destroy the fortifications; or perhaps to the moats which should protect the city from assault and whose waters now flood the town.[1]

"Thy fortified cities are like early figs ready to fall" (iii. 12). This means the outworks and outside fortresses in the suburbs and open country guarding the approaches to the city.[2] These were evidently in danger and would surrender when attacked.

"The gates of thy land are fully opened to thine enemies" (iii. 13). This means the mountain passes by which the Medes and Scythians had advanced into the country, and the great caravan routes.[3] Evidently these were all held by one or other of the allies, and there was no hope that reinforcements or relieving forces could arrive by them.

Finally the spirit of the defending force was broken. "Thy people in the midst of thee are women" (iii. 13).

[1] Billerbeck-Jer. 101–2. [2] *Ib.* 99. [3] *Ib.* 137 and Map III.

None stand in the fight (ii. 9). "Heart melteth and knees smite together and much pain is in all loins and all their faces are pallid" (ii. 10). There is no chance that a garrison in such despair can avert capture and ruin. "There is no healing for thy breach" (iii. 19).

These considerations taken together seem sufficient to establish the position that Nahum wrote this oracle of comfort for his countrymen during the *final* siege of Nineveh.

W. W. Cannon.

(*To be continued.*)

"*PROSTRATE, PRONE, OVERTHROWN.*"

Where a term has had many senses assigned to it, and has been greatly misunderstood, there is manifestly room for a re-examination of its meaning in the light of such evidence as we can throw upon it.

Let us first notice the senses which have been in past time attributed to τετραχηλισμένα, as it occurs in Hebrews iv. 13; undoubtedly a most difficult word to grasp aright. It is rendered "opened" in the Authorised Version, "laid open" in the Revised Version and by Bp. Westcott, "manifested" by Hesychius and Cyril, "disclosed" by Phavorinus, "prostrate" by Alford, and now "exposed" by Prof. Moffatt. Where the four first and the last renderings do not greatly differ, while the fifth is quite distinct, and to my mind more correct. The reasons for these senses are equally at variance. Among the Greek Fathers, Chrysostom derives the idea from victims which are flayed and so laid open; Theodoret from slaughtered animals which are so silenced in death; Œcumenius from sheep which are hung by the neck and flayed; Theophylact from sheep which have their throats cut, or, he adds, as some think,

are hung by the neck, or from the neck, and then flayed; while the two last suggest, as a variation, a possible derivation from bending the neck and looking down, as unable to gaze on the majesty of the Judge, which would, I presume, make the term to signify " abashed," " shamed." We thus obtain the senses, " exposed," " open," " speechless," " confounded." But, besides these, " the word has been popularly explained (I quote Westcott) as used of a wrestler who seizes the neck and thrusts back the head of his adversary (*resupinare*), so as to expose it (the face) fully to sight." Or it has (which he prefers) " the sense of pressing down the head, which agrees with the general idea of prostration." " The most probable clue," Dr. Moffatt holds, " is to be found in the practice of exposing an offender's face by pushing his head back, as if the word were an equivalent for the Latin *resupinata* in the sense of *manifesta*. The bending back of the neck produced this exposure." And he quotes Suet. *Vit. Vitell.* 17. Here the word pertains to punishment, not to wrestling, though it agrees with one of Dr. Westcott's senses. Or again (according to Alford), " its first and most classical acceptation seems to be *to take by the throat*,[1] as an adversary in a struggle, or an athlete in wrestling, might do, for the purpose of overthrowing." While Perizonius, like Moffatt, proposes as its origin " the practice of stripping and bending back the necks of malefactors that all might see their faces and shame " (this includes *γυμνά*). Of the above meanings and explanations we may at once put out of sight all that have to do with sacrifice, for, as Alford correctly observes, " the objection to the *sacrificial* rendering is that the word never seems to have been used of such process." In fact

[1] More likely, " to bend the neck," by passing the arm round it, and so bring to the ground. It has also been thought to signify " to strain or wrench the neck."

it is in its origin, as shewn by many examples, a purely agonistic term taken from wrestling.

Before going further to prove what I say, my assumption is that the term is always used, directly or indirectly, of "throwing," and may, though improbably, get its meaning from the shock to the neck caused by collision with the ground. The compound verb *ἐκτραχηλίζειν* does signify at times "to break or dislocate the neck," and so it is possible that *τραχηλισμός*, as a wrestling term, might denote technically a "neck-break," or a "neck-jar," [1] though it seldom or never arrived at the former pitch. Or, more likely, the verb means "to throw on the head or neck," i.e. headforemost or headlong, "to topple, fling," and so *τραχηλισμός* will be a "throw *or* fling on the neck," a "necker," or a "header," so to speak, an "overturn." See Eur. *Troad.* 750–1: "Having by a sad leap fallen from above on your head (*ἐς τράχηλον ὕφοθεν πεσών*), you will all unpitied break off your breath (expire)." Lucian. *Dial. Mort.* 27. 1: "It will be a pleasant sight . . . to see some going down (to Hades) with difficulty, and, while Hermes thrusts them headforemost (*ἐπὶ τράχηλον ὠφοῦντος*), resisting all the same and struggling on their backs (*ὀπτίους ἀντερείδοντας*) most indecently." *De Merc. Cond.* 39: "You have gone out thrust headforemost (*ἐπὶ τράχηλον ὠσθείς*)." From the literal sense, however, arise metaphorical senses, such as "to plunge, prostrate, overpower, subvert, ruin," as will be seen in the sequel.

Let us note a few examples of its employment in wrestling. Thus Plato *Rival.* 132 c.: "Do you not know him that he has spent all his life in being flung (*τραχηλιζόμενος*), and in glutting and sleeping?" Lucian. *Lexiphr.* 5: "When he came to the gymnasium, one was engaged in hand-grappling, another in flinging (*τραχηλισμῷ*) and upright wrestling."

[1] Apparently it does not mean a "neck-hold *or* neck-clinch."

Galen *De Parva Pila* 2 (I v. 902): " A very great and most excellent work is wrought (thus) in combination with many flings (*τραχηλισμοῖς*) and many wrestling holds, so that head and neck are elaborated by the flings (*τραχηλισμοῖς*)." Plut. *De Cup. Divit.* 7: " No top, no ball, no fling (*τραχηλισμός*), no Academy, no Lycæum." *Anton.* 33: " The young men he (Antonius) took by the middle (or, one after another) and flung (*διαλαμβάνων ἐτραχήλιζεν*)." *Apophth. Lacon. Var.* 41: " In a close hand-grapple *or* clinch, when the thrower (*τοῦ προστραχηλίζοντος*) was uselessly mauling his antagonist and dragging him down to the ground, since the youth who was downed (*ὁ προσπεσών*) was inferior in bodily strength, he bit the other's arm." [1] Almost exactly the same story is told of Alcibiades (Plut. *Alc.* 2). See too *Fab.* 23, for such tussles. Athen. i. 26 (in a description of playing at ball): " Great . . . is the strength consequent upon the upsets (*κατὰ τοὺς τραχηλισμούς*). So Antiphanes: 'Ah me poor wretch, how bad I feel in my neck, *or*, how my neck hurts (*τὸν τράχηλον ὡς ἔχω*).'" Was it football? Stob. *Flor.* v. 66 (Iambl.): " Are you weak? Do not seek what belongs to the strong man, to carry burdens, to throw and be thrown at wrestling (*διατραχηλίζεσθαι*),[2] but do like Diogenes, who, when a man pushed *or* hustled him, and would have thrown him (*ἐτραχήλιζεν αὐτόν*), being weakly constituted would not undergo a throwing-match (*οὐ διετραχηλίζετο*), but, shewing the man the pillar, said, 'My good fellow, push this to serve your turn." xcviii. 72 (Teles.): " By all these (various preceptors) he (the youth) is beaten, diagnosed, flung (*τραχηλίζεται*)." Cf. Xen. *Lac.*

[1] The preposition (*πρός*) in the two verbs seems to mean that the one was throwing the other before him or at his feet, and the other was fallen before him or at his feet.

[2] I take it that the preposition (*διά*) carries the force of " to throw and be thrown (in turns) "; it might mean, " to be properly or completely thrown." The prepositions in wrestling terms are difficult.

5. 9: "You will not easily find a people more healthy or more fit physically than the Spartans; for they are trained equally on the side of legs and of hands and of neck (*ἀπὸ τραχήλου*)," i.e. by means of running, boxing, and wrestling.

Very similar is the applied use of the term in an incident which is related by three different authors, Plutarch (*De Curios.* 12), Ælian (*Var. Hist.* xii. 58), and Diogenes Laertius (vi. 61). According to the first: "Diogenes, descrying the Olympian victor Dioxippus driving in a chariot, and unable to drag his eyes away from a beautiful woman who was viewing the procession, but eyeing her and turning sidelong, 'See you,' said he, 'the athlete being toppled *or* downed (*τραχηλιζόμενον*) by a wench?'" (Or, as Diogenes Laertius has it, "'Behold a warlike ram, how he is downed by the first girl who comes.'") "Similarly (Plut.) you will see the inquisitive upset and turned about *or* round (*τραχηλιζομένους καὶ περιαγομένους*) by every spectacle (*or* show)." With the version of Diog. Laert. compare Theophr. *Charact.* 27: "And, of course, if invited to the Temple (or Feast) of Heracles, he (the Belated Learner) throws off his garment, and lays hold on the ox, in order to throw it to the ground (*ἵνα τραχηλίσῃ*)."[1]

Some other uses follow. Thus Strabo vi. 3 (c. 268): "Charybdis is shewn a little before the city in the channel, an extraordinary depth, into which by natural law the refluxes of the strait bring the boats upset *or* capsized (*τραχηλιζόμενα*) with much gathering and eddying of the waters." Anon. (Arrian.) *Periplus Mar. Erythr.* 57: "Whence (from the wind) . . . those who sail to Limyrica are more frequently capsized (*τραχηλίζονται*)."[2] Joseph. *B. J.* iv. 6. 2: "(Vespasian said that) by letting themselves be prostrated (*τραχηλιζομένους*) by intestine war and dissension they

[1] Or, possibly "to break *or* wrench its neck."

[2] The common reading is *τραχηλίζοντες*, which is here corrected.

(the Jews) undergo more miserable sufferings than even themselves (the Romans) if they attacked would inflict on them when taken." Plut. *Anim. an Corp. Aff. Sint Pej.* 4 : " Being precipitated utterly (*διατραχηλιζόμενος*) without rudder or ballast into trouble and error by pernicious and frenzied courses he falls into a fearful wreck."

Philo several times uses the term metaphorically. So *De Cherub.* 24 : " Unable to hold up his head ever so little, but a martyr to all the evils that assault and prostrate (*τραχηλίζουσι*)." *Quis Rer. Dio. Hær.* 55 : " In its own nature it (the mind) is truly a man who throws where he might be thrown (*τραχηλίζει ἢ τραχηλίζεσθαι δύναται*)." *De Mut. Nom.* 12 : " These things are not wont to be done easily without a struggle, but only when a man engaged in (*lit.* contesting) the contests of prudence is both exercised in the exercises of the soul, and wrestles against the reasonings antagonistic to it and ready to upset it (*τραχηλίζοντας αὐτήν*)." *De Vit. Mos.* I. 54 : " Being prostrated (*τραχηλιζόμενοι*) by their lusts they will submit to do and suffer anything." 59 : " Shall the wars that still remain prostrate (*τραχηλιοῦσι*) your countrymen and relations and friends ? " *De Execrat.* 7 : " The land so severely exercised and prostrated (*ἡ πολλὰ γυμνασθεῖσα καὶ τραχηλισθεῖσα γῆ*) shall breathe freely and hold up its head . . . recovering its strength like an athlete who has been fatigued by his exertions." *Quod Omn. Prob. Lib.* 22 : " If it is agitated by lust, or is enticed by the bait of pleasure, or faints for fear, or desponds for grief, or is upset *or* prostrated (*τραχηλίζεται*) by want, the soul makes itself a slave."

Of ecclesiastical writers, Eusebius occasionally makes use of the term in a manner similar to Philo. Thus *Præp. Evang.* v. 21. 3 : " Nor . . . ought we to praise you for having downed (*ἐπὶ τῷ τραχηλίσαι*) a frenzied man." 25. 4 : " The existing time was well suited to direct and precipitate

(τραχηλίζειν) the stupid *or* fatuous into Delphic and Dodonæan schools of sophistry." 29. 5: "I for my part was not at all surprised at them (the impostors) that they overthrow (τραχηλίζουσι) men for reward, but at thee the god, and at men, that for reward they let themselves be overthrown (τραχηλίζονται)." *Dem. Evang.* iii. 3. 6: "Was this then the deceiver, or is it not rather the case that, as the effect of the highest and only true theology, he does not permit the real deceiver when overthrown (τραχηλισθέντα) to worship many gods (to be a polytheist)?"

In *Apoc. Joh.* 17, we have the term used as in the passage before us: "All things in the air shall be brought down to the earth, also every human nature and every evil spirit with the antichrist, and they shall stand before Me naked and overcome (γυμνοὶ καὶ τετραχηλισμένοι)." We can hardly speak of "standing prone *or* prostrate." In Basil. *De Spir. Sanct.* xx. 51, the word and sense are different: "Whatever are the powers of revolt, which, because they have raised their neck *or* exalted themselves (διὰ τὸ τραχηλιάσαι against the Almighty God, rebel against bondage."

The compound verb ἐκτραχηλίζειν is quite as common as the simple verb, and has the same or a stronger significance. Thus Plut. *De Adul. et Amic.* 16: "Carneades used to say that the sons of rich men and kings learn only to ride, and to do nothing else well; for the teacher flatters them in their studies by praising them, and the wrestler by giving way under them; whereas the horse, neither knowing nor caring whether the man be commoner or ruler, rich or poor, throws (ἐκτραχηλίζει) alike those who are unable to sit him." With which compare Xen. *Cyr.* i. 4. 7, 8: "And they told him this too that it was well to beware of difficult ground no less than of savage beasts; for many had before now been precipitated (κατακρημνισθῆναι) horses and all. And Cyrus readily listened to all these things; but when he

saw a hind start up, he forgot all that he had heard, and went off in pursuit with an eye to nothing else save the way she took. And somehow or other in making a leap his horse fell on his knees and all but threw him too (*ἐξετραχήλισεν*); however Cyrus kept on, though with difficulty, and the horse got up. And when he came to the plain, he hurled his javelin and knocked over the hind, a thing to his credit and a signal success in its way."

The word occurs several times in Aristophanes. Thus *Nub.* 1499–1501: "'You'll break the house, you will.' ST. 'The very thing I'm set upon doing, unless the spade betray my hopes, and I first get my neck broken by a fall, i.e. from the roof (*ἐκτραχηλισθῶ πεσών*).'" *Lys.* 704–5: "You will never cease from these decrees, till someone catches you by the leg, and takes and throws you *or* breaks your neck (*ἐκτραχηλίσῃ φέρων*)." *Plut.* 68–70: "I will destroy this fellow here most miserably; for I will set him on the top of a rock, and then, go away and leave him, so that he may fall and get his neck broken (*ἐκτραχηλισθῇ πεσών*)." Cf. Eur. *Tro.* 750–1: "By a sad leap from above having fallen on your head (*ἐς τράχηλον πεσών*) you will expire."

So too Polyb. iv. 58. 10: "The remaining multitude of the Ætolians was partly trodden underfoot, and partly, as it fled by pathless ways, was precipitated (*ἐξετραχηλίσθη*) down the cliffs." Plut. *Brut.* 31: "Even the little children with cries and howls were some of them leaping into the fire, others were precipitating themselves *or* throwing themselves headlong (*ἐξετραχήλιζεν αὐτά*) from the walls above, others were submitting their throats to their fathers' swords, baring them and bidding them to strike." Here the two terms *γυμνά* and *τετραχηλισμένα* are both represented.[1]

[1] One wonders whether the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews may not have read what would be so popular a work as Plutarch's *Brutus*. As Plutarch flourished about A.D. 80, his *Lives* would most likely precede

A more figurative use is found in Demosth. *Philip.* iii. 62 (124. 7): "If, however, you all of you know these things and consider them, you will see that you must not admit the war into your own country, nor, harking back to the simplicity of the old war with the Lacedæmonians, be thrown headlong *or* get your necks broken (*ἐκτραχηλισθῆναι*), but, so far as possible, you must guard yourselves both by your measures and your preparations, with a care to prevent him stirring from home, and must not engage in a desperate and final *or* decisive struggle, locked like wrestlers in each other's arms." Plut. *Reip. Ger. Præc.* 5: "Nicias . . . perished, carried to Sicily against his will, and precipitated along with (the rest) into destruction (*συνεκτραχηλιζόμενος*)." *De Lib. Educ.* 17: "There is no class more pernicious and none that more entirely and more rapidly precipitates *or* ruins (*ἐκτραχήλιζον*) the youth than that of the flatterers."

Some examples follow from Philo, who uses the compound verb frequently in a metaphorical sense. Thus *De Mundi Opif.* 56: "(The pleasure-lover) with difficulty raises his head, being weighted and dragged down because his incontinence throws him headlong and trips him up (*ἐκτραχηλιζούσης καὶ ὑποσκελιζούσης*)." *Leg. Alleg.* iii. 35: "(Pleasure) therefore has led astray the blind sense . . . in order that the sense being blind may follow a blind guide, viz., the sensible object, and the mind being guided by the two, unseeing both, may be thrown headlong (*ἐκτραχηλίζηται*) and lose all self-control." *Quod Det. Pot. Insid.* 7: "All his practices are ineffectual and never-ending labours prostrating (*ἐκτραχηλίζοντες*) soul and body with hunger and hardships of all kinds." Cf. *De Gigant.* 7: "(The souls) which are weighted with the burden of the flesh, being loaded and pressed, are unable to look up to the heavenly

this Epistle, and the above passage from them offers a feasible explanation of the joint use of the two terms.

revolutions, and being forcibly dragged down by the neck (*κατὼ ἑλκυσθεῖσαι τὸν αὐχένα*), like quadrupeds are rooted to the ground." Again, *De Profug.* 22 : " Whosoever, neglecting the teacher . . . has quitted the things in front . . . and, having thrown him (the teacher) headlong (*ἐκτραχηλίσας*) has turned round to the things behind . . . becomes a pillar (like Lot's wife)." *De Somn.* ii. 19 : " Graceful words, which those who have resolved neither to say nor to think anything wholesome determine with all kinds and methods of wrestling-tricks to seize by the neck and throw headlong and trip up and dash to the ground (*αὐχενίζοντες ἐκτραχηλίζειν καὶ καταρράττειν ὑποσκελίζοντες*)." *De Abrah.* 19 : " Tortures by which day and night he was being exercised and prostrated (*γομναζόμενος ἐξετραχηλίζετο*)." *De Joseph.* 5 : " He lay unable so much as to lift up his head, because the calamity pressed him and prostrated him (*ἐκτραχηλιζούσης*)." *De Septen.* 10 : " Let the governors of cities cease to prostrate *or* ruin (*ἐκτραχηλίζοντες*) them with continual and heavy tributes and imposts." *De Justit.* 12 : " If you exact from the same ground in the springtime tributes of barley and wheat, and in the summertime those of fruit-trees, you will prostrate *or* ruin (*ἐκτραχηλιεῖτε*) it with double imposts. . . . The fertilizing spirit in a thriving soil is (thus) in a manner taken by the neck (*αὐχενίζεται*) and throttled. . . . He who in the case of plants has unlearnt in a private capacity unjust gain, should he come to undertake greater things and become a king, will shew towards men and women alike the habit he has won, by not exacting double tribute nor prostrating *or* ruining (*ἐκτραχηλίζων*) his subjects with imposts." *De Execrat.* 7 : " They cut off *or* undermined the strength of the deep-soiled earth . . . by prostrating it (*ἐκτραχηλίζοντες*) not only with yearly but with daily imposts." *De Præm. et Pœn.* 5 : " Reason . . . loses power, weakens utterly, gives in, just

like a wrestler thrown *or* prostrated (*ἐκτραχηλιζόμενος*) by a mightier strength than his own." *De Placc.* 14: "Grief, by which they were being prostrated (*ἐξετραχηλίζοντο*)." 20: "By considerations *or* reasonings such as these he was being continually over-wrestled (*κατεπαλαίετο*) and in a manner thrown headlong (*ἐξετραχηλίζετο*)." Frag. ex Joh. Monacho (*De Humilitate*): "If you are puffed up by glory and power, like the pilot of a good ship take in *or* reef your sails, that you may not be plunged *or* precipitated (*ἐκτραχηλίσθῃς*) into absurd conduct."

A few more instances from the Silver Age of Greek may be added. So Alciphr. iii. 40: "Alas, O agriculture, how has the thinking-shop of these impostors prostrated *or* ruined (*ἐξετραχήλισε*) thee." Sext. Emp. xi. 179 (p. 722): "The ambitious man is besides precipitated (*προσεκτραχηλίζεται*) into this very passion (of ambition) by the Stoic arguments, according to which virtue and what proceeds from virtue is the sole good." Proph. *De Abstin.* i. 42: "The notion of working at intellectual objects when affected on the side of sensation has precipitated to their ruin (*ἐξετράχήλισεν*) many of the barbarians. . . . And instead of freedom they have plunged into the depth of misery and there drowned themselves."

There are also several examples of the verb in the ecclesiastical writers. Thus Eus. *Præp. Evang.* iv. 22. 13: "Of the philosophers those who seemed to be high-principled *or* earnest as concerning the gods . . . precipitated (*ἐξετραχήλισαν*) the masses and the peoples into the same error." Method. *Sympos.* v. 6. 126: "For this is the straight and short way to heaven, not to trail after one any impediment, not only of those things which precipitate *or* subvert (*τῶν ἐκτραχηλιζόντων*) the man who is excited *or* eager about luxuries and delights, but of those things also which closely copy these." Chrys. *Ad Pop. Antioch. Hom.* xii. 3: "So

that wicked dæmon subverted (*ἐξετραχήλισεν*) the first man, by the hope of better knowledge depriving him of what he had." Basil, *Add. Eunom.* i. 9: "That he chatters thus as the result of the world's wisdom (worldly wisdom), subverted (*ἐκτραχηλισθείς*) by which he applied himself to such novelties of words, it were not hard to demonstrate."

See too Photius *Bibliotheca* 88. 4 (Basil Cilix 107): "In chapter viii., concerning 'The Word became flesh,' he (John the Scythopolite) is precipitated *or* plunges (*ἐκτραχηλίζεται*) into many absurdities." 160. 16 (Ephraim Syrus 196): "Chapter xxxvii. is against the unruly, whom he also represses, before they are precipitated (*μὴ . . . ἐκτραχηλισθέντας*) into the extreme of perdition, by the fear that comes from God and the judgment of the future tribunal (*or* house of correction)." 203. 69 (Job, *Œc. Pragm.* 222): "Chastening the swelling pride, through which also troops of angels having been subverted (*ἐκτραχηλισθέντα*) fell aside *or* transgressed irremediably."

A quotation from *Late Songs* by Margaret Tynan may fitly close this Essay:

THE SLEEP.

"Poor man, though all besmirched, shall keep
Yet the lost innocence of sleep,
And like a child must lie alone
Defenceless, harmless, *overthrown*." [1]

[1] The *italics* are mine.

W. SPICER WOOD.

NOTES AND NOTICES OF RECENT CRITICISM.

IMPORTUNITY?

A Study of Luke xi. 8 (*Διά γε τὴν ἀναιδίαν αὐτοῦ*).

The parable under consideration in verses 5–11 is interesting from more than one view-point, but nevertheless it is very difficult to follow in our English versions because of the word that translators have selected to translate our Greek word "Anaidian" by. The translation of that word by "importunity" is, to say the least, questionable. Were it not the case that so much depends on the word for the understanding of the teaching of the whole section one would be inclined to pass over the translators' difficulty and class it among the many other imperfect translations, but this cannot be done in the case before us, for so much depends upon it. It is not difficult to trace the translators' source and authority; they followed Beza, who has "importunitatem," but the Latin translators are not at one in their translation, for the Vulgate has "Improbitas."

That the Greek has not either of the meanings of the Latin text may be gathered from the fact that in the Attic, Epic, and Ionic, there is never a suggestion of that meaning in the word, but in both classical and dialectical Greek the word always carries a suggestion of "impudence, shamelessness, barefacedness." The following passage from Menander's *Ex Fratrib.* p. 6 is fairly representative of the Greek use of the word:—

"Ος δ' οὔτ' ἐρυθριᾷν οἶδ', οὐδέ δεδοικένια,
Τά πρῶτα πάσης τῆς ἀναιδείας ἔχει·

"The man who is incapable of blushing, and who has no feeling of fear, has reached the height of impudence."

While the Greek usage is clear, the question remains, what does the word "Anaidian" mean in our passage? As the word does not occur again in the New Testament it is difficult to say in what sense it is used here; the only answer possible at first sight is that it has the same meaning as it has generally in Greek. The word or phrase is used in the LXX several times. Deuteronomy xxviii. 50, Proverbs vii. 13, ibid. xxi. 9, Ecclesiastes viii. 1. In each of these cases the Greek word is used for the Hebrew "Ouz" or "Azaz" or their derivatives, the meaning of which

is to strengthen, make fierce, give might, fortify, or encourage. If we could get at the word which the Master used in the Hebrew or Aramaic, the question would be solved, but this we can only guess at; it would seem that Luke's informant used a word derived from "Azaz," and Luke took the LXX representation of it to translate it.

We must come back to the contents and see how suitable such a word is to the parable. Before doing so, however, we must acquaint ourselves with the local colouring of the parable.

The practice of borrowing bread is a matter of everyday occurrence in Palestine, and the borrowed bread is always scrupulously returned. Two methods of supplying the family with bread are in common use: (1) Among the nomads and the inhabitants of small villages the necessary bread is made and baked at home every day, and sometimes before every meal. (2) In the larger villages and towns the bread is made at home, but is sent to a community baker to be baked. Every family has a baking on Friday to provide fresh bread for the Sabbath, and it depends upon the consumption of the Friday's bread as to when the next baking will take place. Economy demands that the new bread shall not be made until the old is almost finished, for the old bread will not be eaten after the new bread is in the house. Accordingly the baking days vary in different families and even in the same homes the baking will not always be on regular days.

It might easily happen, therefore, that if an unexpected guest should arrive on the night before baking day that there would be no bread in the house. Under ordinary circumstances the woman would go to do the borrowing, but as the friend arrives late at night the goodman of the house first opens the door and then goes to borrow the necessary bread.

Generally speaking the request for the loan of bread is responded to with alacrity and cheerfulness, and I have no doubt that it was so in the case represented in our parable. The Master, however, finds it necessary to indicate the motive for the lending, since it was not convenient at night to do so owing to the manner of living in the East. "The door is shut and my children are in bed with me, I cannot arise and give you what you ask." The mode of living in Palestine makes a good case for the man's answer. The room which is used as a living-

room during the day is at night turned into a bedroom. The change is effected in the simplest possible way. The bedding, which is kept during the day in a recess in the wall, is pulled out at bedtime and spread on the straw mats on the floor.

The whole family sleep on the floor of the one room, the father and mother in the centre, the youngest children on the father's right-hand side, while, if there is an infant, it sleeps next to the mother in a cradle. The other members of the family sleep at the sides of the room, the males next to the youngest children, and the girls on the mother's side of the house. If the family is large the entire floor space is occupied and the getting up of any of its members to get at the place where the bread is kept would disturb the entire household.

Having surveyed the conditions which the parable takes into consideration, we must ask what is its lesson ?

If we conclude that what the Master sought to teach was a lesson in persistence, then the word " importunity " is justified, and we are to understand that while the neighbour did not wish to get up to give the bread yet because of the persistence of the would-be borrower he says to himself, " If I do not get up this fellow will keep on knocking and wake the children up ; I will get up and give him what he wants." That this might be the man's view is quite possible and logical. But how are we to translate this into Divine terms without involving ourselves in a very questionable ethical position ? How, indeed, shall we apply such a principle in the case of our Heavenly Father ? It is legitimate to argue that God cannot be expected to answer every petition merely because it is made, and that the granting of them at the mere request would prove more harmful than good for the petitioner ; but the question still remains to be answered that if mere persistence and insistence is going to do it would God not do it without trying our faith and patience ? Can it be possible that the Son of God whose very life consisted in doing the Father's will, that He who was appointed the agony of Gethsemane and there prayed " If it be Thy will let this cup pass from Me," would teach others to come back to God when in His wisdom He had refused the petition at first ? With all due respect to the Fathers, and the commentators since their day, who have held this view, and the many earnest Christians who hold it to-day, I am constrained

to say "this doctrine is of man." It is unthinkable that the Master should in the remotest way postulate such a doctrine, which in the ultimate analysis amounts to a doctrine of forcing God to give us what He would rather not give, and it teaches that persistence will prevail with God. Dr. Bruce even goes the length of classing this parable with that of the "Unrighteous Judge" in order to make his point of importunity clear. But the other parable has nothing in common with this save that both are parables. The other parable deals with the question of "revenge," a question that was soon to become such an issue with His disciples who would be left wondering at God's quiescence while the terrible crime was perpetrated upon their Master. But the other parable has nothing to do with this, save for such as must bolster up their case. The parable stands alone; and while one does not want to draw any conclusions from what goes before the parable, it is at least significant so far as Luke is concerned that he puts it after the request of the disciples that he should teach them how to pray.

While the details of the parable would justify a complete rejection of the idea of importunity, they are not safe guides. We must not press them too much into the service of our main issue. The question is purely one as to the teaching of the Master of the principle of importunity. To me, that is unthinkable both on the basis of the general teaching of our Lord, and on the question of its theological, philosophical, and ethical implications.

But negation is not enough, what can be suggested to take the place of this interpretation? I suggest that the parable lends itself to the following interpretation. That the man who went to borrow the bread went not because of any negligence on his part, nor yet by reason of failure to take the ordinary precautions in life, he went because he was in dire need, it was a need that he could not under ordinary circumstances provide against, and because this was the case the lender will not make any excuses even though it entail disturbing his children, but because of the need of his friend he will arise and give him what he asks. If we may take Luke's version of the parable as fairly accurate, the whole parable is put in the interrogative, "Who among you having a friend," etc.? The whole parable is governed by that clause. But even if we take it that this phrase is a Lucan peculiarity, the fact still remains that the

idea of importunity is one that is difficult of acceptance by many of us. I would forgo every aid that offers itself from the text from my knowledge of the life of the East, or from any other source, but one thing I cannot help urging, and that is, that the doctrine, while very human, is most unlike what we would expect of our gracious Father, and of our Divine Teacher.

We must come back to the word "Anaidian." I have pointed out that the actual word is in the cases quoted above equal to the Hebrew Ouz, which standing by itself means to strengthen, fortify, give might. I take it that the word here is a translation of the word "Leouzou" or "Beaavir ouzou." And the idea implied is, that he will not rise to give it to him because he is his friend, but in order to strengthen, fortify, or encourage him. And the lesson of the parable is that our Heavenly Father will not allow us to suffer, nor to be put to shame, but when we come to Him in our need, He will surely not refuse us what in the nature of the case we could not have gotten for ourselves. If all the other points made be allowed, the argument is complete, and the lesson exhilarating and reassuring. We shall not have to stand and knock, and knock again, nor to ask, ask and ask again, but our petitions will be granted because God loves to answer prayer, and to solve our manifold difficulties when we cannot do so.

N. Levison.

SERMONS I HAVE NEVER HEARD.

Last month I was present at the ordination of a minister in a local Presbyterian church, where the service was dignified and solemn, much more impressive, I could not help feeling, than at a similar service called a "recognition" service which I recently attended elsewhere. I liked the ceremony of the laying on of hands, and also the sermon. But the presiding minister read an Old Testament lesson from the book of Isaiah, chapter fifty, and I thought he might well have chosen his text from the fourth verse: "The Lord God hath given me the tongue of the learned, that I should know how to speak a word in season to him that is weary: he wakeneth morning by morning, he wakeneth mine ear to hear as the learned." This always appears to me to be a deep word upon preaching. (1) The Origin of Preaching, in listening to the voice of God, which alone makes

the preacher independent and alive. (2) The Object of Preaching—" to speak a word in season to the weary," whether they are weary of struggling against temptation or of going on with their duties or of bearing pain. I often feel that young ministers particularly do not realize how many people in their congregations require to be heartened, and that what they want often more than almost anything else is not to receive clever addresses but encouraging counsel. (3) The Inspiration of Preaching—to be wakened quietly every morning by God to His living purpose, not to be roused by some sudden excitement. As a hearer I generally know when a sermon has been concocted out of something in the newspapers of the previous day, and when it comes out of a steady experience of life. It is only the latter class of sermons that are of any service to us ; sermons struck out of a hasty reading of the daily press or of some one else's book of sermons do not go deep enough.

The recent commemoration of Charles Kingsley's death, fifty years ago, set me to read his *Life* again. I was struck by a word in one of his early letters written just after he had escaped an early strain, with few prospects of marriage or of settled work. He says, " What an awful weapon prayer is ! Mark xi. 24 saved me from madness in my twelve months' sorrows ; and it is so simple, and so wide—wide as eternity, simple as light, true as God Himself ; and yet it is just the last text of Scripture which is talked of, or preached on, or used ! " I turned up Mark xi. 24, for any text that saves a man's soul or reason is worth memorizing. It is the word of our Lord to the disciples, " What things soever ye desire, when ye pray, believe that ye receive them, and ye shall have them." It would seem more easy to talk about this text or even to preach upon it than to use it, yet I cannot remember ever hearing a sermon upon it. I think with all respect to scholars that it ought to be taken closely with the next word of our Lord (verse 25). He adds at once, " and when ye stand praying, forgive, if ye have ought against any : that your Father also which is in heaven may forgive you your trespasses." Thus we would get the two conditions for prayer : (i) Faith, (ii) Forgiveness. As it appears to me, our Lord teaches that we must have absolute, unquestioning faith in God, if our prayers are to be answered ; but then He also demands from us a forgiving spirit towards one

another, as if the presence of an unforgiving temper in the heart stood in the way of God's answer to our petitions. This latter requisite is not one which, so far as I can judge, is brought forward sufficiently in the ordinary teaching upon prayer which our pulpits supply.

I have been struck by a single word in a very familiar text. It is the word " acceptable " in Romans xii. 2—" that ye may prove what is that good, and acceptable and perfect, will of God." Here I can understand what is meant by " good " and " perfect," and also, I think, how we are meant to find this out by a spiritual perception. But it is one thing surely to find this out and another thing to act upon it. " Acceptable," I take it, denotes what may be and ought to be accepted. Yet we know what it is to recognize God's will and to hesitate about accepting it. Is not the supreme phase of our religious experience reached when we can say " acceptable, yes and accepted " ?

Some one lately asked me for a text upon which he might speak about credulity and faith ; he desired a Bible word that he might talk about this subject to a gathering of Christian people. The only text that came to my mind was one in 1 John v. 9 : " if we receive the witness of men, the witness of God is greater." We are always receiving the witness of men, believing what they tell us about things or people beyond our immediate knowledge, and the more sceptical some of us are, we are all the more disposed to credit a great deal of what we are told, in certain departments of life. How much more ought we to credit what God tells us ! I am not certain if this is a true interpretation of these words, for hardly anyone nowadays seems to preach from the First Epistle of John, except from i. 7 and iii. 1 ; but I hope it is not unjust to the text.

A devout friend, who belongs to the Anglo-Catholic party in the Church of England, tells me that next to Luther her chief aversion in history is Oliver Cromwell. She regards him as a bloodthirsty hypocrite, and no reasoning will move her in the matter ; I suppose her Irish blood affects her judgment. But, whatever we may think of Cromwell's Irish policy, he was not a hypocrite, and I for one see real religion in his Declaration of 1650, which he issued as Lord Lieutenant in answer to a Roman Catholic manifesto. There are some sentences in that manifesto which quote very aptly from the epistle of St. Jude. I once accom-

panied my friend to an Anglo-Catholic service, at which there was a short sermon on the third verse of that epistle, "that ye should earnestly contend for the faith once delivered unto the saints," but the sermon was a passionate plea for the reservation of the elements, which I am not accustomed to believe was in the primitive Church. However, it is a good text, rightly applied. It might be used profitably to show that (i) the Christian faith is not individualistic ("saints"), that (ii) it is handed down from generation to generation, and that (iii) it requires a personal effort from each generation; it does not persist by means of mere inertia. How to "contend earnestly" for it is another matter, I freely admit. And it is here that Cromwell comes in. He tells the Irish hierarchy and laity how not to contend for Christianity. I quote some of his words: "He that bids us 'contend for the Faith once delivered to the Saints' tells us that we should do it by 'avoiding the spirit of Cain, Corah and Balaam'; and by 'building up *ourselves* in the most holy Faith,' not pinning it upon other men's sleeves. Praying 'in the Holy Ghost,' not mumbling over Matins. Keeping 'ourselves in the love of God,' not destroying men because they will not be of our Faith. 'Waiting for the mercy of Jesus Christ,' not cruel, but merciful!" I cannot persuade my good friend to read these words, or indeed any words of Oliver Cromwell, but possibly some of your readers may be more open-minded.

A. R. M.

REVIEWS.

Ezechiel. D. Johannes Herrmann. Leipzig. Pp. xlvi + 304. M.9, *geb.* 11.50.

The Book of Ezekiel is not one of the most popular portions of the Old Testament. It is surpassed in style and general beauty by parts of the Book of Isaiah and others. The Prophet himself does not possess the personal attractions of Hosea or of Jeremiah, and appeals to the reader as being hard and even brutal in comparison with them. There is no deep and serious discussion of the great problems which exercise the human mind, such as we have in the Book of Job or in Ecclesiastes. Except in a few well-known passages, e.g. the vision of the valley of dry

bones (ch. xxxvii.) or the life-giving Temple river (xlvii. 1–12) there is little which ministers to the needs of the spirit hungry for God in the way in which so many of the Psalms do.

The book is, nevertheless, of great importance. We may feel that H. P. Smith speaks rather too strongly when he says, "Ezekiel is the most influential man we find in the whole course of Hebrew history," but we are compelled to agree with Professor Lofthouse, "that Ezekiel holds the Old Testament together . . . he emphasises, while he bridges, the break between the older Israelitism of the past and the Judaism of the future." He is not merely a Prophet, he is also a Priest, and in him we find the transition from a religion which concentrated on the direct contact between man and God to one which made their association largely dependent on ritual and ceremony. Everyone, therefore, who is concerned with the serious study of Israel and her religion will be interested in the appearance of Professor Herrmann's volume in Sellin's *Kommentar zum Alten Testament.*

It is noteworthy that the earlier generation of Higher Critics left the Book of Ezekiel practically untouched. The criteria which they used in discussing the date and structure of the various books of the Old Testament were almost (though not entirely) confined to questions of style and vocabulary, and to the consideration of doublets, especially where these involved contrast or contradiction. The Book of Ezekiel, as it stands in our Hebrew Bibles, presents the reader with a remarkably uniform diction and style, leaving the impression that in its present form it is in the main the work of a single individual. It was only natural to assume that this individual was the Prophet himself. One of the first commentators to diverge from this opinion was Kraetzschmar, whose work appeared in the Göttingen series edited by Nowack. This scholar followed Cornill in laying great stress on the variations in the LXX, which are almost as striking in this book as they are in Jeremiah. Kraetzschmar was so impressed by them that he developed a theory of parallel editions, and in some parts of his Commentary the two are printed side by side in the translation. These facts suggested to him that the actual composition and arrangement of the book was the work of a redactor, though, unlike some of his predecessors (amongst whom Vernes and Volz may be

specially mentioned), he attributed the substance of practically the whole to Ezekiel himself. In strong contrast to this is the drastic position adopted by Hölscher, who leaves to Ezekiel only the basis of a comparatively small number of the sections into which the book falls. Herrmann's position is much more moderate, and resembles in some ways that hinted at in a recent article by Canon G. A. Cooke in the *ZAW*. He holds that the Prophet preserved his utterances throughout his life, and that the book was compiled by him in his old age. He does not deny that there are later additions, but finds most of these in the last nine chapters.

The method of the Commentary is that usually adopted in other volumes of this series. A section which forms a literary unity (and Professor Hermann gives a great deal of attention to the grouping of the passages from this point of view) is translated, with textual and philological notes at the foot of the page, and this is followed by a continuous exposition of the whole passage. It is obvious that this method is much more convenient for the reader than the older plan of verse-by-verse comment, and it is also fairer to the author himself. It is, no doubt, more difficult to carry through successfully, but the reader will find no reason to complain of Herrmann's work on this account.

There are a number of passages in Ezekiel which seem to defy satisfactory explanation. In the present volume these have been faced courageously and have been discussed thoroughly. On one or two points there are valuable fresh suggestions, and whilst the author would not claim that they are certain solutions of the puzzles in question, they open up interesting possibilities. Amongst these we may mention the conjecture that the difficult figures in iv. 4–6 are to be explained partly on the ground of textual corruption and partly as carrying back the days of Israel's apostasy to the beginning of the reign of Solomon. Another particularly interesting discussion is the treatment of the unnamed " princes " in chapter xix. A useful feature of the sections which deal with the prophecies against foreign nations is the brief historical survey which is given to each people before the exegesis proper begins. Some of the discussions would be improved by the addition of plans and sketches. It is difficult from mere letterpress to see what form Professor Herrmann

ascribes to the divine Car of the visions, or to form a mental picture of the plan of Ezekiel's Temple. The author, however, must not be held responsible for this weakness in his work; it is due to the very difficult economic conditions in the midst of which the book was produced. We can only regret the fact sympathetically, and hope that in a later edition Professor Herrmann will find possible to include the sketches to which he alludes on page 11 of his "Vorwort."

To-day we ask more of a commentator than that he shall help us to expound difficult verses or restore the text. He must first and foremost give us an interpretation of the personality with whose work he is dealing. It is not enough that Ezekiel's words should be expounded; we want the man himself explained. It is Professor Herrmann's success on this side of his work which is likely to appeal most strongly to his readers. This is more important than criticism and more valuable than philology—many people who entirely fail to share the views, say, of Duhm on the text of Jeremiah, will love and value the work for the sake of its marvellous insight into the character of the Prophet. Professor Herrmann does not go out of his way to give us a character sketch of Ezekiel, but nevertheless he leaves us with a clear conception of the kind of man he was. The presentation that is offered to us is that of a man who was both a priest and a theologian. His dogmas and his judgments are not based primarily on observation of fact, but are rather deduced from what the Prophet knows God to be. This may to some extent explain the apparent harshness, crudity and even grotesqueness of the form which so many of his prophecies take. Yet he is a man to whom God and His word were the supreme and only interest in life, and he has deliberately sunk himself and subordinated his own personality and feelings in order to give expression to the will of God. He is a vessel completely emptied that it may be filled anew with the divine message and principle. If the conception of God and His methods with which Ezekiel leaves us is that of omnipotent and mechanical justice, it must be remembered that he was willing to apply his principle to his own life and work. He himself was subject to the immutable laws of God as completely as any other man, and all that he could do either for himself or for his people was to see that he observed these laws, that he made no mistake in the performance of the

duties that God had laid upon him. Yet from rare indications —of which Herrmann rightly makes the most—it is possible to see below the surface, and to find in Ezekiel a man of like passions with ourselves, a man who gave love and felt bitter sorrow, yet suppressed it all in the interests of the God who had called him.

T. H. Robinson.

* * * * *

La Syrie à l'époque des Mamelouks, d'après les Auteurs Arabes. By Gaudefroy-Demombynes. Pp. cxix, 288. Paris, 1923.

This book is, in the first place, a translation of El-Qalqashandi's great work written in the fourteenth century for the use of the Government officials of Egypt, of whom he himself was one. It includes a geographical description of Syria and an account of the administration of the country under the Mamluk sultans. A very large number of notes, amplifying El-Qalqashandi's statements have been added by the translator, who has also written a valuable introduction. The geographical part of the volume supplements and is similar to Guy Le Strange's *Palestine under the Moslems*. Taken altogether it is a great storehouse of information about the condition of Syria (including Palestine) in the fourteenth century. It supplies an important link in the history of names and localities and a welcome key to the understanding of the Arabic names of offices and officers of State. The condition of Christians under Moslem rule, the history of coinage and of the Khalifate may be named as illustrations of the numerous topics about which many details are given.

A paragraph is devoted to the beliefs and customs of the Samaritans (p. 64). Yaqut (early thirteenth century) says that they do not visit Jerusalem except in case of absolute necessity, and that they "throw a stone in the direction of it, when they set out." There seems to have been a colony of Samaritans in Damascus in the fourteenth century (p. 169).

A remarkable incident in the history of the Crusades is related by Qalqashandi and discussed by his translator (pp. 126–128). Some of the prisoners taken by the Moslems in the beginning of the year 1183 are said to have been brought to Mekka in the Pilgrimage month (April) and sacrificed there along with the usual animal victims. They were part of an expedition fitted out by Reginald of Kerak against the Holy Cities.

A very striking parallel to Samson's use of foxes as a means

of destroying crops (Judges xv. 4 f.) is reported from Mesopotamia (p. 262 f.). Foxes and hunting dogs were employed together. Both kinds of animals had fire securely attached to their tails. The foxes were released first and the dogs sent in pursuit of them. A suitable day of wind was chosen for the execution of the plan. The animals, with men in charge waiting their opportunity, were concealed in caves near the fields to be attacked. It is said that the device was in common use and of old standing. Whatever may be thought of Samson as an historical personage, it is evidently dangerous to dismiss his exploits as mere imaginations out of all touch with reality. There can be no doubt that a study of the life and history of the near East, in any period, has still many new contributions to make, such as this, to our understanding of Biblical literature and history.

Wm. B. Stevenson.

PREACHERS AND PREACHING.

In Quest of Reality. By Rev. James Reid, M.A. Hodder and Stoughton. 5*s.*

With Mercy and with Judgment. By Rev. Alexander Whyte, D.D. Hodder and Stoughton. 7*s.* 6*d.*

The Dilemmas of Jesus. By Rev. James Black, D.D. Hodder and Stoughton. 7*s.* 6*d.*

It may be thought that nothing can be said to-day about preaching that has not been already and better said by Beecher and Philipps Brooks, by Spurgeon and Dale. One can well understand Mr. Reid's confessed reluctance to consent to the publication of yet another book on homiletics. Preaching, however, is so infinite in its variety, and so acutely sensitive to the spirit of the age, that if a man will but assume that the works of the old masters are known, and give some account of his own aims and methods in preaching to an audience very different from theirs, he can hardly fail to say some things that are fresh and pertinent.

There are many books on preaching, but not too many *good* books. It is a matter for regret that Dr. Whyte's humility prevented him from accepting invitations to lecture on the art of which he was so great a master. We hope that the editor of the sermons before us, Rev. J. M. E. Ross, or Dr. Barbour

may yet collect the *obiter dicta* on preaching that must be scattered through Dr. Whyte's class notes.

Yet, suggestive as such a book would be, we suspect that Mr. Reid is a safer model and a safer guide for young preachers than Dr. Whyte. The great Scottish preacher's amazing industry, his individuality of expression, and above all the reality of his spiritual warfare, are indeed worthy of all admiration and imitation. But he would be a bold, and not a wise man who would follow this master in his choice of texts, in his divisions, in his quotations. Dr. Whyte's beloved puritans—saving only Bunyan—lie undusted on our shelves, though on his advice we "sold our beds" to buy them. Dr. Whyte's uniqueness as a preacher lay in a certain quality of imagination which no industry can buy. Who but Dr. Whyte could safely have dared such a hyperbole as the following?

"Come then, away, O downcast soul! Come away! And William Cowper, and you, and I, will one day hold a three-cornered contest in heaven as to which of us three has the most wonderful story to tell, and the most wonderful song to sing. I think I know who will carry away the prize from you both. Nay, I am sure I know! 'Of whom I am chief'" (pp. 91–2).

Great preaching, like great poetry, defies the ordinary canons of criticism. Mr. Reid instances Chalmers as a man whose genius broke through physical conditions which seemed to make anything like eloquence impossible, but he rightly insists that mannerisms which were forgotten in a Chalmers may be a very real hindrance to less gifted preachers. Again, he says that the true minister is more interested in people than in ideas. Yet Newman and Dr. Whyte were perhaps more interested in ideas than in people, and derived not a little of their authority from a certain remoteness from the petty concerns which make up so much of the life of most men and women. They descended to the pulpit as from the mountain top, and seemed at times to forget their hearers, as their faces shone with the vision of the Lord.

"With Mercy and with Judgment" contains a tremendous sermon on "The Ransom" which was "an unforgettable event in the spiritual life of those who heard it." In that sermon the preacher seems to turn his back on the congregation and to kneel in adoration before the Cross. And it was a sermon of

the same kind by Newman that so impressed J. A. Froude in his college days. Dr. James Black thinks that we dwell too much on the physical pain of the Cross. Perhaps we do. Our Lord's sorest agony was spiritual. Yet the great preachers, like the great painters and like the evangelists themselves, dwell much upon the physical sufferings of our Lord, not because He suffered more than others have done, but because, in Newman's daring phrase, "He to whom these things were done was Almighty God."

Great preachers are a law unto themselves; the ordinary preacher will find safer guidance in Mr. Reid's pages. Mr. Reid, despite the example of Chalmers and Dr. Whyte, thinks that a spoken sermon is more effective than a read one. So, curiously enough, did Dr. Whyte. "Never read your sermons, gentlemen," he once told the astonished divinity students in his Bible class, "unless," he added, "you should become the minister of S. George's, where you will have to dot every i, and stroke every t." But Mr. Reid insists that every sermon should be written out, though it should be spoken and neither read nor mandated.

Mr. Reid believes that preaching is worth while. He has no patience with that disparagement of preaching which is heard in certain quarters. "Listening to a really good sermon may be a very real devotional exercise." The distinction, so often drawn, between worship and preaching is really a barren one. There is no reason why worship should not be intelligent and preaching devotional. We are not sure, however, that Mr. Reid helps the cause of Protestantism by describing it as a religion of "insight," as opposed to "a religion of magical operation and external authority." Presbyterianism, at any rate, acknowledges the authority of the Church in matters of discipline and in the Sacraments as means of grace. Our Lord is presented not in the Word alone, nor in the Sacrament alone, but in both.

What is the preacher's aim? "We cannot better Paul's summary of his own message to the Corinthians, 'Jesus Christ and Him crucified.'" But no two preachers will preach Christ in just the same way.

Take Dr. James Black. Dr. Black is a born preacher. His style is as individual as that of his great predecessor in the pulpit of United Free S. George's Church, Edinburgh. He has a dramatic instinct which is not wholly concealed by the

printed page. "I love this view of His flashing eyes. A fierce, angry, passionate Christ. . . . Then we teach our children to sing 'Gentle Jesus, meek and mild.' *Mild?*" We hear the scorn of the preacher's voice.

Dr. Black can "get across." He understands men. He uses their everyday language. He can reach their hearts And Dr. Black has a message; his message is the message of all true preachers—"Jesus Christ and Him crucified." "To express the purpose of this book, I borrow that ancient prayer, 'Sir, we would see Jesus.'" It is cheering, but not surprising, to find that this so modern and so popular a preacher does not need to leave the Gospels in order to hold a great congregation. Dr. Black has his own way of preaching Christ, and it is a daring one. He has sought to get behind the incidents of the gospel story, and to portray the inner life of Jesus, and that at its most critical moments, the moments of decision.

There is, of course, nothing new in this method of approach. It is the method of Hermann of Marburg, and of Prof. J. A. Robertson in *The Spiritual Pilgrimage of Jesus.* But it must still be something of a novelty in the pulpit.

It is a method which has its obvious advantages. Our age is interested in psychology. Modern novelists and biographers are concerned with the spiritual development of their characters. There is a real curiosity—not necessarily irreverent—regarding the self-consciousness of Jesus. It may seem to be the preacher's duty to meet this curiosity, so far as he is able. We have no doubt that Dr. Black has succeeded in making his Master real to many to whom He was before only an abstraction.

But the method is not without its serious difficulties. The data for reconstructing the inner life of Jesus are so very meagre.

There is, of course, the story of the Temptation, and Dr. Black's treatment of "The Dilemma in the Desert" is admirable. He is, we think, less successful, when he deals with our Lord's Baptism: "The Dilemma at Jordan," or with what he calls "The Dilemma of Popularity," "They would come and take him by force, to make him a king." From the very nature of the case the treatment here is largely imaginative.

Let us add this last word. There is a false reverence in preaching Christ which really arises from a lack of faith in Him. We may differ at times with Dr. Black's presentation of the

mind of Christ. No two portraits of Jesus are the same. But we feel that this preacher's very daring in portraying the Master, arises, not from irreverence, but from his intense belief in the reality of Him whom he seeks to commend to his hearers. And when a man preaches as though Christ were at his elbow his preaching will get home.

D. W. Greenfield.

CURRENT LITERATURE.

Mr. Henry Coates, F.S.A. Scot., has published *The Letters of Paul the Apostle* (London: Robert Scott, 3*s.* 6*d.*), a handbook which is the outcome of personal experience in teaching Bible-classes. The author says that his aim is best put in biological terms. "Treating the series of Letters as an organic whole, I have endeavoured to follow the methods of comparative anatomy, by placing side by side similar parts of different letters, in order to bring out both the affinities and the variations of the component parts." Yet this has been done without sacrificing the life of the subject. Mr. Coates has catered effectively for his audience, and the book ought to throw light for many readers on the significance of the epistles and upon the personality of the Apostle. There is a map, and also an index.

* * * * *

To the Devotional Commentary Series there has now been added *The Book of Jeremiah* (Religious Tract Society, 3*s.* 6*d.*). The author is the Rev. H. Elvet Lewis, M.A. He has had an unusually difficult task. "If one could imagine a volume of selections from Dante—from his *Vita Nuova* (which contains prose and verse), his *De Monarchia*, his *Convivio*, and his *Divina Commedia*—one would apprehend more clearly how the book of Jeremiah is made up." Also, besides the variety of the book, there is its shifting background. But Mr. Lewis has succeeded in extracting devotional suggestions from unlikely passages, without forcing the text. The last two chapters are upon the Book of Lamentations, which are taken to be the work of the prophet. Each of the chapters in the book closes with an application and a prayer. It is a book which many devout readers of the Bible will welcome, for its spiritual tone and aptness of religious comment.

INDEX.

PAGE

Rev. W. Emery Barnes, D.D.
Bible and Kor'an 14

Rev. Professor J. H. Baxter, B.D.
Reviews 314

Dr. W. Ernest Beet.
The Reconstruction of the Apocalypse: A Criticism . 339

Rev. Buchanan Blake, D.D.
The Apocalyptic Setting of the Thessalonian Epistles . 126

Rev. Canon G. H. Box, D.D.
Reviews 71

Rev. A. T. Cadoux, D.D.
The Feeding of the Multitude 114

Rev. Professor C. J. Cadoux, D.D.
The Visits of Jesus to Jerusalem 175
Reviews 387

W. W. Cannon, Esq.
Some Notes on Nahum 280, 433

Rev. R. Dunkerley, B.A., B.D.
Anglo-Saxon Agrapha 286

Rev. E. W. Price Evans, M.A.
The Ten Best Books on Preaching 405

Rev. H. J. Flowers, B.D.
The Third Commandment 260, 325

C. J. Gadd, Esq.
The Nabopolassar Chronicle again 85

PAGE

Rev. D. W. Greenfield, M.A.
Reviews 237, 468

Dr. Hugo Gressmann.
The Mysteries of Adonis and the Feast of Tabernacles . 416

Dr. Adolf Keller.
A Theology of Crisis 164, 245

Rev. Professor Howard T. Kuist.
Does Philippians iii. 10–14 suggest a Method in Prayer? 382

Rev. N. Levison.
Importunity? A Study of Luke xi. 8 456

Rev. Innes Logan, M.A.
Prophecy and Sacrifice 62

A. R. M.
Sermons I Have Never Heard 229, 460

Professor H. R. Mackintosh.
The Grouping of German Theologians 377

Rev. J. M. McWilliam, B.A.
A Criticism of Pessimism 217

Dr. J. P. Naish.
The Book of Job and the Early Persian Period . 34, 94

Rev. Professor T. H. Robinson, D.D.
The Ten Best Books on the Book of Job . . . 357
Reviews 69, 147, 463

Rev. William Robinson, M.A.
Gnosticism and Life 206, 298

Rev. D. M. Ross, D.D.
Reviews 234, 313

Rev. Professor A. T. Robertson, D.D.
Some Interesting Readings in the Washington Codex . 192

PAGE

Rev. Professor W. B. Stevenson, D.Litt.
Reviews 144, 145, 467

Rev. P. Thomson, D.D.
"Know" in the New Testament 379

Rev. G. W. Wade, D.D.
The Ten Best Books on the Apostolic Age . . 5

Rev. Professor Hugh Watt.
Reviews 391, 392

Rev. W. Spicer Wood, M.A.
"Prostrate, Prone, Overthrown" 444

INDEX TO BOOKS REVIEWED.

PAGE

Black's *The Dilemmas of Jesus* 468
Cadman's *Christianity and the State* 237
Contenau's *La Glyptique Syro-Hittite* 145
Demombynes' *La Syrie à l'époque des Mamelouks* . . 467
Dennis's *Hippo Regius* 316
Diehl's *Inscriptiones Latinæ Christianæ Veteres* . . . 314
Herrmann's *Ezechiel* 463
Horner's *Pistis Sophia* 392
Hrozny's *Code Hittite* 144
Jean's *Šumer et Akkad* 145
MacNicol's *Making of Modern India* 234
Mee's *The Children's Bible* 231
Milligan's *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament (Part V)* . . 232
Mirbt's *Quellen zur Geschichte des Papsttums* 391
Moffatt's *Translation of the Old Testament* . . . 71, 147
Piepenbring's *The Historical Jesus* 151
Reid's *In Quest of Reality* 468
Scott's *Ethical Teaching of Jesus* 153
Shaw's *Christian Gospel of the Fatherhood of God* . . 313
Simpson's *Pentateuchal Criticism* 69
Streeter's *The Four Gospels* 387
Whyte's *With Mercy and with Judgment* 468
Windisch's *Der Zweite Korintherbrief* 233

INDEX TO SUBJECTS DISCUSSED

	PAGE
Anglo-Saxon Agrapha	286
Apocalypse, Reconstruction of	339
Apostolic Age	5
Baxter, Richard	81, 163
Christian Beginnings	322
Civilization, Philosophy of	242
Colossians iii. 14	67
Commandment, The Third	260, 325
Corinthians, First Epistle to the	50, 198
Corinthians, Second Epistle to the	228
Crisis, Theology of	164, 245, 324
Dicey, Professor A. V.	244
Doddridge	84
German Theologians	377
Gnosticism	206, 298
Gospel, Jesus in First	401
Gospels, Text of the	192
Guidance, Divine	82
Hopefulness	162
Immortality, Problem of	323
Importunity ?	456
Jesus and Jerusalem	175
Job, Book of	34, 94, 225, 357
Julian, The Lady	242
Koran, The	4, 14, 321
"Know"	379
Love, Christian	67, 163
Mark viii. 1–10	114
Mark x. 17–31	143
Multitude, Feeding of	114
Mysticism and Catholicism	402
Nabopolassar Chronicle	85
Nahum	280, 433
Pain, The Problem of	242
Parables of Jesus	104
Pessimism	217
Philippians iii. 10–14	382
Preaching	405, 468
Prophecy and Sacrifice	62
Prostration	444
Proverbs, Book of	223
Reviews and Studies	404
Sermons	229, 460
Sin, Doctrine of Original	244
Schweitzer, Dr. Albert	241
Sonship	162
Tabernacles, Feast of	416
Temple, Cleansing of the	3
Thessalonian Epistles	126
Thouless, Dr.	242
Truth, Love of	2
Washington Codex	192

Printed in Great Britain by Butler & Tanner Ltd., Frome and London

Da

3 2400 00276 5687

DATE DUE

MAY 10 2013

MAY 06 2019

DEMCO, INC. 38-2931

Expositor
DE 28 '59
MAR 1 1963
JUN 21 1963
NOV 24 1965
v.3
1925:1
6 1964
CBPac
Expositor
1925:1
ser 6
v. 3